NAG HAMMADI &
MANICHAEAN STUDIES

The *Panarion* of Epiphanius of Salamis

Book I (Sects 1-46)

Second Edition, Revised and Expanded

***

Translated by
FRANK WILLIAMS

BRILL

The *Panarion* of Epiphanius of Salamis

Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies

Editors

Einar Thomassen & Johannes van Oort

Editorial Board

H.W. Attridge – R. Cameron – A.D. DeConick
W.-P. Funk – I. Gardner – C.W. Hedrick
S.N.C. Lieu – P. Nagel – B.A. Pearson
S.G. Richter – J.M. Robinson – K. Rudolph
M. Scopello – W. Sundermann – G. Wurst

VOLUME 63

The *Panarion* of Epiphanius of Salamis

Book I (Sects 1-46)

Second Edition, Revised and Expanded

Translated by

Frank Williams

BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2009

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication-Data

Epiphanius, Saint, Bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, ca. 310–403.
[Panarion. Book 1. English]
The panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis. Book I (Sects 1-46) / translated by Frank Williams.
p. cm. — (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean studies ; v. 63)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-90-04-17017-9 (hardback : alk. paper) 1. Heresies, Christian—Early works to 1800. 2. Gnosticism—Early works to 1800. I. Williams, Frank. II. Title. III. Series.

BR65.E653P36413 2008
273'.4—dc22

2008031553

ISSN 0929-2470
ISBN 978 90 04 17017 9

Copyright 2009 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

For Charlotte

CONTENTS

(Most sections of the work are titled as in the manuscript. Modern titles are noted with an asterisk.)

Acknowledgment ix
Introduction xi
Editions and Works Consulted xxxv
Abbreviations xli

*Letter of Acacius and Paul 1

*Proem I 3

*Anacephalaeosis I 9
*Proem II 13
1. Barbarism 15
2. Scythianism 16
3. Hellenism 18
4. Judaism 20
5. Against Stoics 22
6. Platonists 24
7. Pythagoraeans 24
8. Epicureans 25
*Judaism, continued 25
9. Against Samaritans 32
10. Against Essenes 37
11. Against Sebuaeans 38
12. Against Gorothenes 38
13. Against Dositheans 38
14. Against Sadducees 40
15. Against Scribes 41
16. Against Pharisees 42
17. Against Hemerobaptists 45
18. Against Nasaraeans 46
19. Against Ossaeans 48
20. Against Herodians 53
*De Incarnatione 55

*Anacephalaeosis II 59
21. Against Simonians 61
22. Against Menander 68
23. Against Satornilus 69
24. Against Basilides 75
25. Against Nicolaitans 83
26. Against Gnostics 90
27. Against Carpocratians 109
28. Against Cerinthians 116
29. Against Nazoraeans 123
30. Against Ebionites 131
31. Against Valentinians 165
32. Against Secundians 208
33. Against Ptolemaeans 214

*Anacephalaeosis III 227
34. Against Marcosians 229
35. Against Colorbasians 252
36. Against Heracleonites 256
37. Against Ophites 261
38. Against Cainites 269
39. Against Sethians 276
40. Against Archontics 283
41. Against Cerdonians 292
42. Against Marcionites 294
43. Against Lucianists 364
44. Against Apelleans 366
45. Against Severians 373
46. Against Tatianists 376

Corrected Passages 381
Indices 383

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I need to thank Professor Christoph Markschies for his kindness in furnishing me in advance of publication with a copy of the *Wortregister* to Holl's *Panarion*. I must also thank Herr Friedrich-Christian Collatz, our Series editor Stephen Emmel, and Ivo Romein and Ellen Girmscheid of Brill for their understanding and support, and my daughter Marge for her important technical help.

INTRODUCTION

This translation of Book I of Epiphanius' *Panarion* was originally published in 1987 and was reprinted with a few changes in 1997. Demand for it has been sufficient to warrant a second edition, which is offered here. The opportunity has been taken to review and revise the translation, edit and expand the notes and index and add indices of references. Together with its companion volume, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis, Books II and III, De Fide* (1994) this is the only current version in a modern language of the *Panarion* in its entirety.[1]

Several works of significance have appeared since 1983. Aline Pourkier's important *L'héresiologie chez Épiphane de Salamine* (1988) carries further the study of the *Panarion*'s sources which was begun in the nineteenth century by Richard Lipsius, and also analyzes Epiphanius' ways of dealing with his data. Pourkier tests Lipsius' conclusions on ten Sects, seven of them from Book I. In the course of her study she translates extensively from the *Panarion* and from Epiphanius' predecessors Irenaeus and "Pseudo-Tertullian" and his younger contemporary, Filaster of Brescia.

Philip Amidon's *The Panarion of St. Epiphanius of Salamis, Selected Passages* (1990) could be termed a modern epitome of the *Panarion*. It renders those passages which describe sects but omits Epiphanius' refutations. Amidon's rendition amounts in all to about two fifths of the work.

Jon Dechow's *Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity, Epiphanius of Cyprus and the Legacy of Origen* appeared in book form in 1998 although it had previously been available on microfilm. Dechow translates excerpts from Epiphanius only incidentally but provides a penetrating study of his life, the anti-Origenist aspect of this thought, and the Origenist controversies of his last years.

Finally, of extreme importance to students of Epiphanius is the 2006 publication of Holl's *Wortregister* to the *Panarion* through the good offices of Friedrich-Christian Collatz, Christoph Markschies and other scholars. Awaited for nearly a century, this invaluable tool also includes grammatical and subject indices, and besides facilitating the study of the *Panarion* should make practicable the revision of Holl's critical text.

---

[1] A nineteenth century Russian version exists but is rare, and long out of print.

The present work has been compared with all of these and is indebted to them all.

Text

We render Karl Holl's critical text of the *Panarion*'s Book I. The first 33 Sects are from Holl's *Ancoratus, Panarion Book I* which was issued, with Sachapparat and textual notes, in 1913. The rest are from Holl's second volume, republished in 1980 by Jürgen Dummer. The 1980 volume includes an appendix in which Dummer assembled suggestions which various scholars had made for the improvement of Holl's text. We translate these in the body of our work, marking them with an asterisk and providing a short appendix which gives the Greek alternatives.

The revision of Holl's text has often been mooted, but the lack of the *Wortregister* has stood in its way. The enterprise ought now to be practicable. However, to revise this enormous text must be a long drawn out affair requiring the cooperation of many scholars.

Holl published the principles of his treatment of the *Panarion*'s text in 1910. He concluded that the eleven extant manuscripts, none of them complete, all descend from a single poorly copied archetype, and that the text has been contaminated by atticizing scribes. In the preface to his 1913 edition he complained that modern editors' dislike of Epiphanius had influenced their view of his text, that on the one hand they had emended without reference to his distinctive style and vocabulary, but on the other had allowed absurdities to stand because Epiphanius was thought to be "konfus."

In fact, within his parameters Epiphanius is a particularly clear thinker. His Greek has its peculiarities but he sets forth his aims and methods clearly at the outset, carries them through consistently, seldom digresses and returns to his point when he does, and provides the reader with every help he can. The difficulties of the text are the results either of scribal error or of Epiphanius' language.

Holl's is a carefully edited critical text. He sometimes emends, but more often restores a word or phrase, occasionally a longer unit. His restorations clear up many difficulties and usually appear to be the most logical choice. Now and then the text gives a good sense without restoration and the *Panarion*, partly written but mostly dictated and that under pressure of time, may not have been as smooth as Holl supposed. Nonetheless there can be little doubt that Holl has given us a fair approximation of what Epiphanius wrote.

Epiphanius' Life and Writings

Our chief sources of information about Epiphanius are his own works and correspondence, references in the writings of his friend Jerome, in Palladius' *Dialogue on the Life of John Chrysostom*, and in Basil of Caesarea, Theophilus of Alexandria, and the histories of Socrates and Sozomen. The short biographical notice prefaced to ancient editions of Epiphanius' *Ancoratus* is of doubtful value, as is the legendary life ostensibly by the monks John and Polybius.

Early in the fourth century C.E., perhaps between 310 and 320, Epiphanius was born in Palestine at Besanduc, a village in the environs of the city of Eleutheropolis, near Gaza. It has been suggested that his parents were Jewish converts to Christianity. In favor of this are the facts that he was bilingual in Greek and Syriac and knew a good deal about Jewish Christian sects; against it, that his attitude toward Jews was antagonistic and his knowledge of their customs meager.

That Epiphanius' family sent him to Egypt in young manhood suggests that they were well to do. If his *Letter to Theodosius*[2] is authentic they had brought him up "in the faith of the fathers of Nicaea," and Sozomen says that he received his early education from monks (*Hist.* 6.32). An important influence on him was his friend and mentor Hilarion, who is credited with bringing the monastic life to Palestine and who in his turn had been taught by Anthony of Egypt.

Epiphanius' childhood background helps us understand him. Indoctrinated in childhood with Nicene Christianity, he was under monastic influence in his early years. His education, Christian and scriptural rather than classical, would have reinforced his childhood training. The homoousian version of Christianity was crucial to his identity from the first. It is no wonder that any rival approach appeared to him as a threat—Epiphanius would have termed it a "poisonous snake"—to be repelled at all costs.

Epiphanius' destination in Egypt would have been the school of a rhetor in the great city of Alexandria. Here he had the disturbing encounter with a sexually oriented group whom he identifies as Gnostics and describes in the *Panarion*'s Sect 26. Although we cannot know this, this episode, dangerous to his chastity and described by him, even years later, in an emotional manner,

---

[2] Cited in Nicephorus *Adversus Epiphanium* XIV, 61, Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense*, p. 340,8-10. See Holl, "Schriften."

might have been a turning point. At the least it helps explain his detestation of anything gnostic, and his conviction that all Gnostics were immoral.

His literary style, or lack of it, shows that he did not complete his rhetorical training. Instead he joined an Egyptian monastic community, where he remained for some years. Unfortunately we do not know which one. Given his avid reading it must have emphasized knowledge as well as praxis. On the other hand, his virulent anti-Origenism almost guarantees that it took the anti-Origenist side of the controversy then raging among the monks of Egypt.

Returning to Palestine, probably nearer to the age of 30 than to the 20 the preface to the *Ancoratus* mentions, Epiphanius founded a monastery near Eleutheropolis and served as its abbot. His friendship with Hilarion, whose monastery was also near Gaza, continued. Jerome tells us (*Vita Hilarionis* 1) that when Hilarion died Epiphanius circulated a short work in his praise.

Of his years as an abbot we know only his efforts to foster and defend what he regarded as Christian orthodoxy. *Panarion* 40,1,6, his only personal reminiscence of his abbacy, shows him exposing and banishing a Gnostic monk. When in 359 the bishop of Eleutheropolis, Eutychius, signed the evasive creed of the Council of Seleuceia (*Panarion* 73,25,1-26,8) and attempted to enforce the homoeousion on his diocese, Epiphanius was uncooperative. It was during this period that he visited the homoousian bishop Eusebius of Vercelli, in exile at Tiberias, and there met the converted Jew Josephus of Tiberias who told him the colorful story he relates at *Panarion* 30,4,1-12,9.

According to Jerome (*Contra Joannem* 4, PL 23,358D) Epiphanius was instrumental in persuading Eutychius to change his mind. It has been suggested, however, that it was the discomfort of the relations between homoousian abbot and homoeousian bishop which prompted Epiphanius' move to Cyprus—a move which led to his election to the see of Salamis in 366.[3]

The clergy of Cyprus, restive under the patriarchate of Antioch and inclined to look to Alexandria for guidance, would have welcomed a homoousian of wide reputation, a friend of Athanasius and an ascetic. The *Panarion* shows so much interest in the monastic life that we must visualize Epiphanius, once a bishop, as continuing his own austerity. (He did not require abstinence from meat and wine, however, and was suspicious of

[3] A conflict with Eutychius, however, is by no means the only possible reason for Epiphanius' move. For various alternatives see Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism*.

leaders who enforced this requirement.) Jerome's *Vita Paulae* tells us that he fostered the monastic movement, and that his fame attracted novices from all over the world. He allowed a degree of autonomy to the other bishops of his far flung province. *Ancoratus* 102-107 shows us that he was missionary-minded, eager to convince pagans of their error and bring them into the fold. And though we have no information about his episcopal administration, the *Panarion*'s clear organization and meticulous attention to detail suggest administrative capacity. It may have been Epiphanius who began the construction of the great basilica, the ruins of which still stand near Famagusta.

Epiphanius' prestige was great; Jerome refers to him as Papa Epiphanius, and others may have done the same. The abbots Acacius and Paul, whose letter he publishes at the beginning of the *Panarion*, write, "For not we alone, but all who hear of you, confess that the Savior has raised you up as a new herald, a new John, to proclaim what ought to be observed by those who resolve on this (monastic) course" (*Letter of Acacius and Paul* 1,6). At a time when the Arianizing emperor Constantius did not hesitate to exile an Athanasius, the Arian emperor Valens left Epiphanius in peace (Jerome, *Contra Joannem* 1.4, PL 23,358-359). To interfere with him would presumably have risked an uproar.

Epiphanius was respected not only for his piety and rectitude but for his learning. Churches far from Cyprus consulted him on doctrinal issues. The *Ancoratus*, of which we treat below, is his reply to inquiries from the church at Syedra in Pamphilia. The *Letter to Arabia* concerning Mary's perpetual virginity (*Panarion* 78), is another example of his responses to queries. At some time he gathered a collection of extracts from Marcion's canon which could be used to refute Marcion's thesis; he publishes these, together with his comments on them, in the long *Panarion* 42. "Even in extreme old age," Jerome tells us at *De Viris Illustribus* 114, Epiphanius continued to publish short works.

His earliest surviving datable work is a fragment of a *Letter to Eusebius, Marcellus, Bibianus and Carpus*, preserved on pages 218 and 219 of Codex Ambrosianus 515. This was written somewhere between the years 367 and 373. It defends the Antiochean dating of Easter, used by the church on Cyprus, on the Sunday after Nisan 14, rather than on the Sunday after the spring equinox, the Alexandrian observance.[4] It includes a chronology of Christ's last week on earth which resembles one found in the *Apostolic*

[4] See Holl, *Bruchstück*.

Constitutions, and to which there may be an allusion at Nag Hammadi's *Apocryphon of James* 5,9-14.

Arguably Epiphanius' best work is the *Ancoratus*, written in 374. The "barque" of the church of Syedra, says the introductory correspondence, cannot enter harbor because of contrary winds of wrong doctrine, particularly concerning the Holy Spirit. Epiphanius shows how a man can become "anchored" (*Letter of Palladius* 1,3; *Ancoratus* 119,16). Besides the Holy Spirit the work discusses the Trinity and Christ's incarnation and resurrection, attacks the doctrines of Origen, and includes a polemic against Greek religion. At 12,7-13,8 we find the outline of what was to become the *Panarion*, showing that Epiphanius already had this work in mind. This was begun, in fact, in 374 or 375 and can be considered a sequel to the *Ancoratus*. We discuss it below.

During this same period, about 376, Epiphanius attempted to resolve a scandalous schism in the important church of Antioch; he tells the story at *Panarion* 77,20,3-24,2.[5] The Christian community there was divided into four factions, headed respectively by the Arian Euzoeus and three representatives of homoousian Christianity, Melitius, Vitalius and Paulinus. Melitius had the allegiance of the majority but was in exile.[6] Vitalius had been consecrated by Apollinarius of Laodicea, a respected bishop whose Christology was, however, suspect. The third, Paulinus, had the support of Damasus of Rome; he was a disciple of the former bishop of Antioch, Eustathius, staunch homoousian and participant in the Council of Nicaea who, however, had been exiled on a charge of Sabellianism. Unknown to Epiphanius the situation was further complicated by Vitalius' teaching, learned from Apollinarius, that Christ's mind (νοῦς) was not human but only divine.

Epiphanius had already encountered distorted forms of this doctrine, brought to Cyprus about 370 by young disciples of Apollinarius. *Panarion* 77,2,1-6 describes some of their ideas and speaks of the calling of a synod to condemn persons of this kind. On his visit to Antioch Epiphanius discovered Vitalius' adherence to the same doctrine, in a milder form but one which he still found shocking. Thus he could not enter into communion with Vitalius. Nor, for reasons we do not know, did he consider communion with Melitius. On the strength of Paulinus' written confession of faith Epiphanius, and the Cypriote church with him, recognized him as the lawful bishop of Antioch.

---

[5] Dechow's *Dogma and Mysticism* gives a full account of this complex episode.

[6] *Panarion* 73,28,1-34,2. Nautin, however, doubts that Melitius was ever exiled.

This unfortunately left Paulinus' and Vitalius' congregations at odds with each other. Epiphanius attempted to gain support for Paulinus from the influential Basil of Caesarea, but to no avail. Apollinarius in the meantime rejected both Epiphanius and Paulinus and consecrated new bishops. The results of Epiphanius' measures at Antioch show both the extent of his influence and the limitations of it. On the one hand, no one appears to have resented his intervention in a see not his own; but on the other, his word was by no means always taken as law.

Whether Epiphanius attended the First Council of Constantinople in 381 is very doubtful. During the winter following, however, in 382, he traveled to Rome with Paulinus and Jerome to attend a synod called by Damasus to discuss the relations between the western and eastern churches. If Epiphanius hoped that Damasus would affirm his earlier support of Paulinus he was disappointed; Damasus now suspected him of Sabellianism. During this time, however, Epiphanius boarded with the wealthy widow Paula and was instrumental in persuading her to abandon the luxurious life of a Roman aristocrat for the cloister. She journeyed east with Jerome as her chaplain and founded a convent at Bethlehem (Jerome, *Vita Paulae* 20). A few years later, perhaps in 385, we find Epiphanius visiting her on her sickbed and laboring, unsuccessfully, to convince her that drinking wine when ill is proper (Jerome, *Vita Paulae* 20).

Seven years later, in 392, Epiphanius published his *De Mensuris et Ponderibus*, a manual of information for students of scripture In 393 we find him on another visit to Palestine, traveling to Bethel to share a service with the bishop of Jerusalem, John. In a village church he found a curtain painted with the image of Christ or a saint, tore it down at once, and advised the parishioners to use it as a burial shroud for the poor. His *Letter to John* (Epiphanius/Jerome *Epistle* 51) relates the incident and includes Epiphanius' promise to replace the curtain. It also, rather lamely, explains Epiphanius' ordination to the priesthood of Jerome's brother Paulinian—an uncanonical one since, although it took place at Epiphanius' monastery near Eleutheropolis, Paulinian was to serve at Bethlehem, in John's diocese. Most importantly, however, this *Letter* addressed to the convinced Origenist, John, is an anti-Origenist tract and was circulated as such.

Epiphanius' war on Origenism and Origenists dominates what we know of his last years. This had nothing to do with Origen himself, who was long dead. Epiphanius admired Origen's *Hexapla* and appreciated some of his writings (cf. *Panarion* 64,3,5-7 and 5,5-6), but considered his doctrine gnostic and the source of Arianism. Important among his objections, published as early as the *Ancoratus* and repeated in the *Panarion*, were Origen's allegedly subordinationist view of the Trinity, his doctrine of the preexistence, fall and

restoration of all souls including Christ's and Satan's, and his denial—or so Epiphanius saw it—of the resurrection of the body.

From 393 until 397 Epiphanius fought against Origenism in Jerusalem and Palestine. His opponents were John of Jerusalem and Rufinus, almoner to the abbess Melania on the Mount of Olives and translator into Latin of Origen's περὶ ἀρχῶν. His chief ally was Jerome. A monk named Atarbius, it is thought at Epiphanius' instigation, made the rounds of Jerusalem's monasteries demanding that monks who were suspected of favoring Origen sign a formal denunciation of his teachings. Jerome signed. Rufinus, predictably, refused to see Atarbius.

Either the festival of the Encaenia or the Holy Week of 397 saw an ugly incident at Jerusalem. Invited to preach in the morning, Epiphanius delivered a denunciation of Origen which was plainly aimed at John. John retorted in the afternoon with a sermon against anthropomorphism, a view which some monks certainly held and with which Origenists often stigmatized their accusers. A few days later John published a confession of faith. Epiphanius could find no fault with it but, still unsatisfied, wrote in 394 his *Letter to John.* This was circularized among the bishops and monks of Palestine, accompanied by another letter which urged them to break communion with John. Instead of replying John wrote an apologia to Theophilus, Athanasius' successor as patriarch of Alexandria. This in turn called forth Jerome's *Contra Joannem* which stated his own version of the case against Origen. Jerome also wrote a *Contra Rufinum*, although he and Rufinus made peace in 397.

Next followed the crisis of the Origenist controversy in Egypt. Under heavy pressure from anti-Origenist monks, Theophilus abandoned his previous tolerance of Origenism and proceeded against the Origenist monks of Nitria, 40 miles from Alexandria. Early in 400 he convened a synod which condemned the reading or possession of Origen's works. This was followed by a decree of exile for the Nitrian Origenists, accompanied by the wrecking of their cells and the burning of their books. Theophilus wrote for support to the churches of Palestine and Cyprus, and in particular urged Epiphanius to convene a similar synod on Cyprus. This he did, and jubilantly announced the result in a letter to Jerome (Epiphanius/Jerome *Epistle* 91).

Meanwhile the exiles from Nitria had made their way to various Christian and monastic centers. Led by Isidore and the distinguished Tall Brothers (Ammonius, Dioscurus, Eusebius and Euthymius) about 80 came to Constantinople and appealed for help to the patriarch, John Chrysostom.

Whatever his own attitude toward Origen, Chrysostom showed sympathy for the exiles and wrote to Theophilus urging their reinstatement. Epiphanius was then moved to set out on what proved to be his last journey, a voyage to Constantinople for the defense of Christian orthodoxy and the unmasking of John's supposed Origenism.

Arriving in the spring of 402 or 403, Epiphanius declined Chrysostom's offer of hospitality and communion. He, however, held his own service outside the city and, uncanonically, ordained a deacon. Socrates (*History* 6.10.12-14) and Sozomen (*History* 8.14-15) give differing accounts of the subsequent events. According to the later Sozomen Epiphanius had an encounter with Ammonius which convinced him of his own injustice. Socrates, however, says that while on his way to a public appearance in the Cathedral of the Holy Apostles Epiphanius was confronted by Chrysostom's archdeacon Serapion, who accused him of uncanonical behavior and warned him of the danger of a riot. Whatever the truth of the matter, Epiphanius left Constantinople without taking any public action. He died at sea on his way home to Cyprus. His refusal to communicate with John was used as ammunition by John's opponents at the Synod of the Oak in 404.

Nautin has written: "Il est assurément dommage pour le mémoire d'Épiphane, que sa dernière intervention dans l'histoire de l'Église ait été celle-là." Epiphanius' savage harassment of anyone who appeared to approve of Origen is indeed difficult to stomach. In his defense it may be urged that he was Palestinian, and had also lived for many years in Egypt. Was he not defending hearth and home against what he saw as a dangerous virus? As to his support of the rather unsavory Theophilus, Riggi has reminded us of his reverence for the see of Alexandria. Our heresiologist would have been unlikely to suspect the motives of a successor to Athanasius.

Epiphanius' writings against images appear to date from the same decade as the *Letter to John*. This concern makes itself apparent already in the *Panarion* where, at 27,6,9-10, he attacks Christian image-making. Three writings against Christian images can be partially reconstructed from conciliar *acta* and other sources.[7] These are called a *Treatise against Those Who, by Idolatrous Custom, Are Accustomed to Make Images Representative of Christ, the Mother of God*

[7] John of Damascus, *De Imaginibus Oratio* I.25; *Acts of the Council of 754*, Mansi XIII 292D; *Acts of the Council of 787*, Mansi XIII 293D; Nicephorus *Apologia Minor* PL 100 837B; *Adversus Eusebium*, Pitra *Spicilegium Solesmense* IV 292-294; Theodore Studita *Antirrhetum* II PG 99 388A; 484A/B; *Epistula* 36 *Ad Naucratem* PG 99 1213D.

and the Martyrs and further, of Angels and Prophets; a *Letter to Theodosius*; and a *Testament to the Citizens* (of Salamis).

Another of Epiphanius' works, *De Gemmis*, also comes from the last decade of the fourth century. Preserved only in a Latin epitome, it discusses the symbolism of the stones in the high priest's breastplate. It was written for Diodore of Tarsus and witnesses, both to the close attention with which Epiphanius read scripture and to the fact that during this period of his life he was engaged in other pursuits than an obsessive opposition to Origen. In fact we do not have all of his writings; Jerome's notice at *Vir. Ill.* 114 implies that there were a large number. To their contents we have no clue, but Quasten's criticism of the smallness of his *oeuvre* seems unjustified.

The Panarion

Epiphanius' major effort is very long, and was divided by its author, first into three Books and then into seven Sections. Holl's edition, with notes and apparatus, occupies about 1500 pages. It was begun in 374 or 375 (*Panarion* Proem II 2,3) and produced in great haste, in less than three years. Book I, translated here, extends through Sect 46 and comprises somewhat more than a third of the whole.

The *Panarion* is an heresiology: that is, it is a work which describes bodies, systems and views which the author regards as subversive of true religion and presents his arguments against them. The genre is found in the Christian, the Muslim and some oriental traditions, and is alive today. In Epiphanius' time it was well established; his Book I is deeply indebted to Hippolytus and Irenaeus, both of whom had Justin Martyr for a predecessor. Epiphanius in his turn served as a source for Theodoret and others.

Unusually for an ancient author, Epiphanius titled his own work. At the very outset he explains this title and its meaning and lays out the plan and purpose of his book:

> (Proem I 1,1-2)…I am writing you a preface to give the gist of my <treatise> against sects. Since I shall be telling you the names of the sects and exposing their unlawful deeds like poisons and toxic substances, matching the antidotes with them at the same time—cures for those who are already bitten, and preventatives for those who will have this misfortune—I am drafting this Preface here for the scholarly, to explain the "Panarion", or chest of remedies for the victims of wild beasts' bites. It is a work in three Volumes and contains eighty Sects, which answer symbolically to wild animals or snakes.

Epiphanius' intent then is to convert and to protect. His means of doing so is to identify wrong doctrines so that his fellow Christians can keep away from them, and to convince of the truth those who have stumbled into these doctrines. He has been called an "heresy hunter" but the term scarcely expresses what he meant to do. It has also been pointed out that he was following conventions which by his time had been fixed. While this is so, his vehemence makes it plain that he was not merely falling in with some established pattern; he meant every word of what he wrote.

In his second Proem he explains what he means by "antidotes":

> (Proem II 2,3) "And to correspond with these (serpents and beasts) I shall give as many arguments, like antidotes, as I can in short compass—one or two at most—to counteract their poison and, after the Lord, to save anyone who cares <to be>, when he has willingly or inadvertently fallen into these snakelike teachings of the sects."

These quotations will show that Epiphanius is writing, not simply of heretical ideas as such but of heretical ideas in the context of the sects which hold and teach them. As he most often uses it the term αἵρεσις refers to the party or faction—the "sect"—which holds a particular error. Typical of this usage is Epiphanius' description of the followers of Simon Magus:

> (21,1,1) "Simon Magus's makes the first αἵρεσις to begin in the time since Christ. It is made up of persons who do not rightly or lawfully <believe> in Christ's name, but who do their dreadful deeds in keeping with the false corruption that is in them."

Epiphanius does occasionally use αἵρεσις to mean "heresy" as at 21,5,6 where we read, "For who can fail to realize that this sort of αἵρεσις is a myth…" Nonetheless "sect"—which we prefer to "faction" because of its ecclesiastical connotation—is what he usually means by the word. Further, he terms the individual chapters of the *Panarion* "Sects"; when this is his meaning we capitalize.

The *Panarion* opens with two Proems, the first consisting of Epiphanius' own tables of contents, the second a formal Introduction which explains the work more fully. The whole concludes with a "brief and accurate description of the catholic faith and apostolic church," usually called *De Fide*.

Epiphanius sets his Sects in an historical framework. They begin, not after Christ as we might expect, but with Adam, and extend through the author's own lifetime. His total of 80 sects comes from Song of Songs 6:8-9: "There are threescore queens, and fourscore concubines, and virgins without number. My dove, my undefiled, is but one." The 80 concubines

are groups which bear Christ's name but lack his faith, as a concubine uses her master's name but is not his wife. The one dove is the catholic church. The virgins without number are various "philosophies" which are in no way related to Christ—or to anything important (*Panarion* 35,3,5 and *De Fide* 6,9). The 60 queens are the generations from Adam until Christ, with their number rounded off (*De Fide* 4,1-5,4). This last exegesis is labored but, given Epiphanius' historical approach, not inappropriate.

Epiphanius felt his procedure to be justified because of Colossians 3:11, "…there is neither Hellene nor Jew…barbarian, Scythian…but Christ is all and in all." Barbarism, Scythianism, Hellenism and Judaism, to which Epiphanius adds Samaritanism, are the first sects and the "mothers" of the rest. To these five Epiphanius adds four badly misreported Greek philosophies, four Samaritan groups, and seven types of Judaism, making a total of 20 before Christ. Next follows his attractive account of "Christ's sojourn here, and true advent in the flesh in person," a short description of Christ's ministry and of the planting of the church, which we call *De Incarnatione*. Then, in what the author believes to be the order of their succession, follow the 60 sects which have arisen after Christ. The *Panarion* may fairly be called an historical encyclopedia of sectarianism.

Preceding each Section of the work is an Anacephalaeosis, or "summary."[8] These are not authentic. Epiphanius makes no mention of them in the body of his work, though he does speak of the Proems and of his concluding essay. The Anacephalaeoses are so worded as to suggest that they are meant to be read as a whole. III, for example, ends "this will summarize the three Sections of Volume I, which includes 46 Sects," although this summary begins only with Sect 34. The Anacephalaeoses sometimes disagree, in small details or even in order, with the material of the *Panarion.* They are an epitome of the work which originally circulated independently but at an early date was edited into it. Augustine used them, presumably in Latin translation, as the basis of his *Contra Omnes Haereses*; whether he ever saw the *Panarion* itself is highly doubtful.

In discussing a sect Epiphanius, consciously or unconsciously, falls into a sort of four part form.[9] First comes a brief introduction giving the sect's name—to Epiphanius a very important matter—relating it to the sects which our author believes preceded it, and furnishing biographical details

---

[8] Amidon calls it an "abstract."

[9] Pourkier believes that Epiphanius' form was influenced by that of Hippolytus' *Syntagma*, a document which will be discussed below.

concerning its founder. Then follows a concise description of the sect's beliefs and practices. The third part, the refutation, is normally the longest. The usual close is a few lines which compare the group under discussion to some noxious animal, most often a poisonous snake. However, this form is not always strictly adhered to; description and refutation are often mixed together.

In the later portions of the *Panarion* where Epiphanius is discussing his contemporaries and persons of the recent past, what he says about the succession of various groups or the influence of one leader upon another comes from his own knowledge. In Book I, where the leaders of whom he speaks are well in the past, he is dependent upon his sources for this sort of information. He knows, for example, that Simon Magus is the father of all the sects since Christ's coming because Irenaeus says so. From Irenaeus, again, he learns that a number of sects which called themselves Gnostics arose, all at once, from Valentinus. That Lucian was Marcion's disciple, and Apelles Lucian's, he learns from Hippolytus. When his sources give him no specific guidance of this kind he is more cautious:

> (29,1,1) After these (Cerinthians) come Nazoraeans, who originated at the same time or even before, or in conjunction with them or after them. In any case they were their contemporaries. I cannot say more precisely who succeeded whom.

In other words, Epiphanius has little or no independent information about the genesis of the various sects. Nor are the names that he and his predecessors apply to the sects to be relied on. These are really labels, meant to identify and classify some group of whom Christians must beware. Epiphanius himself says that the terms Alogi (51,3,1-2) and Antidicomarians (Proem I 4,1) are his own coinage. Rarely are such names the ones the group in question gave themselves, though "Gnostic" may be an exception. Equally rarely do they represent organized bodies—though, again, there were Marcionite and Valentinian churches. The *Panarion* contains much material of historical value, but Epiphanius' names for the sects and his reports of their successions are not the best areas in which to look for it.

For the content of his refutations of sects Epiphanius takes inspiration where he finds it. He often draws on other authors. Thus his arguments against the Noetians (Sect 57) are adapted from a document which is called *Zwei Predigten Hippolyts* by Schwarz and *Contra Noetum* by Holl, but which is thought by Pourkier and others to be a fragment of Hippolytus' lost *Syntagma*. Apart from this we cannot be certain how much refutatory material Epiphanius found in Hippolytus, but a number of his logical arguments

against Gnosticism are inspired by Irenaeus' *Haereses*, especially his Book II. Our footnotes occasionally refer the reader to such passages.

However, Epiphanius does not use the work of earlier heresiologists in a wooden or mechanical manner. He often quotes from them at length, but as often adapts or expands on their points in his own fashion. They served as stimuli to his thinking.[10]

We can be the most certain that we are hearing Epiphanius' own voice when, as he does time after time, he quotes scripture to prove a point. He was proficient in biblical exegesis as his age understood the discipline, and his scriptural refutations can be pithy and forceful. A good example of his manner is his censure of the Nasaraeans' refusal to eat meat:

> (18,2,4-3,1)...not only are the events recorded in scripture famous to this day, but even the sites of the wonders are preserved. First there is the spot where Abraham offered the ram to God, called Mount Zion to this day. Moreover, the site of the oak of Mamre, where the calf was served to the angels. But if Abraham served a meat-dish to angels, he would not fail to share some of it himself. Moreover, the tradition of the lamb <which> was slaughtered in Egypt is still famous among the Egyptians

and our author goes on to discuss an Egyptian folk custom of which we learn only from him. Similarly revelatory of his controversial ability are his anti-Marcionite arguments at 42,11,15f, based on excerpts from Marcion's canon of scripture.

Epiphanius strove for brevity, and achieved it more often than the *Panarion*'s length would suggest. Sometimes his subject runs away with him, as in Sect 30 where he first relates the long story Josephus of Tiberias told him (30,4,1-12,10) and later discourses against Ebionite doctrines at considerable length. More often when a Sect is lengthy it is because Epiphanius has quoted source material. Thus Sect 31 reproduces in full an otherwise unknown Valentinian document (31,5,1-6,10) and then an extensive passage from Irenaeus (31,9,1-32,8). 33,3,1-7,10 quotes the whole of the *Epistle of Ptolemy to Flora*, our only text of this work. Such quotations form an important part of the *Panarion*'s usefulness.

---

[10] Cf. Pourkier's discussion of this subject in *L'hérésiologie*.

The Sources of the Panarion

As plainly as he lays out his purpose and format, Epiphanius sets forth his sources of information at Proem II 2,4:

> Some of the things <about> sects and schisms which I shall be telling the reader, I owe to my fondness for study. Certain things I learned from hearsay, though I came into contact with some through my ears and eyes. I am confident that I can give an account, from accurate report, of the origins and teachings of some sects, and part of what goes on among the others. Of these latter, I know one from the works of ancient authors, another by listening to learned men who confirmed my notion precisely.

The *Panarion* then is based on information gained both from others and at firsthand, and on literary research. Of Epiphanius' search for informants we find an echo at Basil *Epistle* 258, in which Basil answers his inquiry about Magusaeans, a group Epiphanius decided to classify as a "philosophy" (*De Fide* 13,1). When he speaks of personal experience he is thinking chiefly of the "Gnostics" of Sect 26, but he knew a great deal at firsthand about the Archontics of Sect 40 and something about the Sethians of Sect 39. Besides he often had lively interchanges with persons of other persuasions and the *Panarion* contains reminiscences of these.

However, the majority of his information is documentary. Of the many sources of the long *Panarion* we list only those which underlie Book I; Epiphanius often assists the reader by naming them. He speaks of "Clement (of Alexandria), Irenaeus, Hippolytus and many more" (28,33,3); of Eusebius (29,4,1), the *Book of Jubilees* (39,6,1), the *Travels of Peter* (30,15,1), the *Ascents of James* (30,10,6), a Clementine treatise addressed to "elders and virgins" (30,2,6), a *Gospel according to the Hebrews* (30,13,1-8), the *Book of Elkasai* (19,2,1-4,9) and the *Apostolic Constitutions* (45,4,5).

At 27,6,4 Epiphanius quotes Clement of Rome without remembering that his source is the *First Epistle*. Works which he uses without giving their names are Eusebius' *Chronicle* and *Praeparatio Evangelica* and Hippolytus' *Chronicle*. In addition to the long quotations from Gnostic works which we have mentioned, he gives shorter ones from some others. These will be discussed below.

Of all of these sources the two most important are the lost *Syntagma* of Hippolytus and the *Contra Omnes Haereses* of Irenaeus. The former supplies much of the framework of Book I and of Sects 48, 50, 54-55 and 57 of

Book II. We know of it from the catalogue of the library of Photius, ninth century patriarch of Constantinople, where it is called a βιβλαρίδιον:

> There was read: a βιβλαρίδιον of Hippolytus. Hippolytus was a disciple of Irenaeus. It was the syntagma against αἱρέσεις which begins with the Dositheans and continues until Noetus and the Noetians. He says that Irenaeus refuted them in his preaching with arguments which he, Hippolytus, says that he has summarized in the book he has composed.

A series of sects or heresies which seems to correspond with this is found in the *Panarion* and in two other documents: the *Diversarum Haereseon Liber* of Epiphanius' younger contemporary, Filaster of Brescia; and the spurious thirtieth chapter of Tertullian's *Praescriptio Haereticorum*, commonly referred to as Pseudo-Tertullian. This latter, the earliest of the three, is thought to be a third century epitome of the *Syntagma*. It mentions 29 sects or heresies, although for the Noetus with whom the *Syntagma* was said to end it has substituted the third century monarchian Praxeas. With some variations, and sometimes with other groups interspersed between Pseudo-Tertullian's 29, Epiphanius and Filaster contain substantially the same list in substantially the same order; further, the three documents between them share many items of information. The *Syntagma* then appears to be the common source of all three, and from them some of its content may be reconstructed.

The *Panarion*'s dependence upon the *Syntagma* was proposed by Lipsius in 1865 and elaborated by Hilgenfeld in 1884, and in our time has been tested by Pourkier. Objections can be offered to the idea, but it accounts for the data in so many cases that it must be taken as preferred.[11]

As important as Hippolytus to Epiphanius is Irenaeus whom he calls "successor of the apostles," "elder beloved of God," "holy." Epiphanius has read at least three of his Books, probably his entire work, and often quotes him—never Hippolytus—at length. He introduces Irenaean material in Sect after Sect, and when discussing the Valentinians and their relatives depends upon him entirely. This is the case with Sects 22, 23, 27, 31 and 34-36.

None of these sources are Latin and nothing in the *Panarion* is taken from Books V-VIII of Hippolytus' (or Josephus') *Refutatio*.[12] Whether this

---

[11] For a full presentation of the arguments see Pourkier, *L'héresiologie*. Despite much evidence to the contrary, it is possible that, as well as the *Syntagma*, Filaster knew at least something about the *Panarion* and on occasion used it as a source. See the notes to Sect 42.

[12] For convenience we refer to this as a work of Hippolytus. Pourkier, following Nautin,

is because Epiphanius did not know the work, or simply because he was uninterested in philosophy, is a "judgment call." When the *Panarion* seems to include Hippolytean material, this is usually from the *Syntagma* or Irenaeus, sources which are utilized by Epiphanius, and apparently in some books of the *Refutatio*. Ideas or doctrines similar to those mentioned by Epiphanius of course appear now and then in the *Refutatio*; we refer to them in our footnotes.

Finally, an extremely important source of Book I and of all the Books of the *Panarion*, is holy scripture. Where its testimony is available Epiphanius prefers it to all others.

The Panarion *and Gnostic Literature*

Sect 26 is rich in references to Gnostic literature. We find a short passage from a *Gospel of Eve* at 26,3,1, one from a *Questions of Mary* at 26,8,1 and one from a *Gospel of Philip* (not identical with Nag Hammadi's) at 26,13,2. At 26,2,5 Epiphanius names a *Gospel of Perfection* but cites nothing from it. At 26,8,1 he refers to *Apocalypses of Adam* which may or may not include the one we know from Nag Hammadi, and to "books about Ialdabaoth" and "books in the name of Seth." This last is of interest since both NHC VII,2 and VII,5 have Seth's name in their titles. *Panarion* 39,5,1 also speaks of books "in the name of Seth"—in this case, seven of them—and 40,7,4 of books "in the name of Seth and his seven sons."

There are likewise several mentions of books called *Allogeneis*, or Strangers. These are found at 39,5,1, 40,2,1 and 40,7,5. Again, we have found works which bear this title. NHC XI,3 is called *Allogenes*; the fourth tractate in the Codex Tchacos, *The Book of Allogenes*. The Codex Tchacos, also, has recently shown us that there was indeed a *Gospel of Judas*, which Epiphanius read of in Irenaeus and mentions at 38,1,5.

The discoveries at Nag Hammadi, and now of the Codex Tchacos, have enlarged our understanding of Gnosticism and its relationship with the great church. We can now see the data from the viewpoints both of persons who loved Gnosticism and persons who hated it. Epiphanius knows the teachings of the Gnostics only superficiallly. He does not appreciate their seriousness, or the delicate allegory, exegetical ingenuity and imaginative beauty of some of their writings. He says repeatedly that Gnostics mean

---

takes the author of this work to have been one Josephus. For the arguments see Nautin, *Hippolyte et Josipe*.

merely to glorify themselves and cause trouble and that they are all immoral or, if chaste, hypocritically so. In reporting their doctrines he sometimes commits gaffes. He confuses the roles of the exalted aeon Barbelo and the fallen Sophia, identifies the Demiurge with an entity he calls Deficiency, and believes inaccurately that the Gnostic Christ is no more than a wraith or phantasm. Nor is he correct in asserting that Gnostic resurrection is merely a "resurrection of the soul," although some Nag Hammadi passages might give this impression.

Nonetheless he and his fellow heresiologists provide a fairly good index of the characteristic ideas, exegeses and mythologumena, the most important personae, and the most typical expressions of Gnostic literature. Nag Hammadi and our other Gnostic discoveries on the one hand, and the heresiologists on the other, are witnesses confirmatory of each other, and should both be read by the student of the period. It is difficult to read either the *Panarion* or the Nag Hammadi tractates without being reminded of some passage in the other. We have documented a number of parallels in our footnotes; others will find more.

Epiphanius as a Writer

The poorness of the *Panarion*'s style must not lead us to suppose that Epiphanius was an uneducated lout. This important Christian leader who was on friendly terms with Athanasius, conferred with Damasus, corresponded with Basil, and was in contact with dignitaries of the first rank, had been exposed to good written and spoken Greek. The excerpts from others' writings which he includes in the *Panarion* are enough to show us this.

Though he came nowhere near matching the great Christian rhetoricians of his century, Epiphanius, when he took pains, could write an acceptable ecclesiastical style. His *Letter to Arabia*, found in Sect 78, compares in quality with Athanasius' *Letter to Epictetus of Corinth* of Sect 77. It follows the outline proper for an epideictic oration and is couched in simple but effective sentences. Much of the *Ancoratus*, in form an epistolary reply to letters from three well educated correspondents, is in smooth Greek. Its opening, though turgid, is flowery enough for any rhetorician.

Proem II of the *Panarion* likewise exhibits the elements which were expected in a preface: the deprecation of the author's competence, the explanation of the work's subject and of its intent. That Epiphanius did not complete his rhetorical training does not mean that he learned nothing from it.

For the *Panarion*'s awkwardness there are other reasons than Epiphanius' lack of a classical education. One is his attitude toward Greek culture. He distrusted Greek education, and the art of rhetoric with it: "I do not care for the art of rhetoric, but for my readers' benefit" he says at 31,35,1. Moreover, he is concerned that his work be accessible to simple monks, "the little ones in the cloisters," of whom Acacius and Paul speak. At Proem II 2,5 he states that he intends to write "not with eloquence of language or any polished phrases, but with plain speech in a plain dialect, but with accuracy of the facts my speech conveys." This may explain the avid reading of his work "by the simple *pro verbis*," as Jerome remarks. "The simple" could understand what he wrote.

Most importantly the huge *Panarion*, begun and finished within three years, is for the most part oral Greek. It was chiefly dictated, we may suppose in haste, and taken down just as Epiphanius delivered it. His stenographer and scribe, the deacons Anatolius and Hypatius, sign their names at the end of *De Fide*. Presumably Epiphanius had notes before him, or copies of some of his sources, but much of his composition is plainly *ad lib*. Thus at 30,13,2 he suddenly interrupts his discussion of Matthew's gospel in Hebrew to bark out, "And they call this thing 'Hebrew'!" His assistants must have grinned.

Epiphanius' sentences show more coordination than subordination and will often simply run on until they finish a story. A short example—which we break into more than one sentence—is found at 30,18,3, where Epiphanius tries in one breath to tell the reader all he knows of Ebionite customs. When in a hurry he may cover his ground with a long string of genitive absolute phrases. Not often but in a few instances a sentence will not quite construe throughout; this is due, one assumes, to the speaker's haste. An Epiphanian sentence can be a tangle as in his invective against Valentinians and Gnostics at 31,1,1-2. Sometimes, as at 29,3,7-9, one can be no more than several elements set side by side, scarcely deserving the name of "sentence." All this evidences oral composition and probably lack of time for revision—the busy bishop would have had little time for that.

This oral delivery can be effective. There are passages of lively argument, like the discussions of the Demiurge and "matter" at 36,4,5f or of the origin of evil at 24,6,1-3. Epiphanius' imaginary "dialogues" with heretics long dead are vivid and amusing. Sometimes we find a well arranged extemporaneous sermon, as when Epiphanius pillaries the Ophites in Sect 37. Sometimes he almost achieves the level of diatribe:

> (21,5,1) But this doctrine is refuted by the truth itself. If Simon is the supreme power of God and the tart he has with him is the Holy Spirit,

> as he says himself, then he should give the name of the power—or else say why a title has been found for the woman, but none at all for himself! (2) And how does it happen that Simon went the way of all flesh one day at Rome when his turn came—when the wretch fell down and died in the middle of the city of Rome?
>
> 5,3 <And> why did Peter declare that Simon has no part or share in the heritage of true religion? (4) And how can the world not belong to a good God, when all the good have been chosen from it?
>
> 5,5 And how can the power which spoke in the Law and the prophets be "lefthand," when it has heralded Christ's coming <from the> good God in advance and forbids all wrongdoing? (6) And how can there not be one Godhead and the same Spirit, of the New Testament and of the Old, since the Lord has said, "I am not come to destroy the Law, but to fulfill"? And to show that the Law was delivered by himself and proclaimed through Moses, while the grace of the Gospel has been preached by himself and his advent in the flesh, he told the Jews, "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me also, for he wrote of me."

A strength of Epiphanius is his ability to tell a story. What he says at 40,4-7 of the Gnostic Peter is a short example, the colorful narrative of Josephus at 30,4-12 a long one. The brief anecdotes he relates here and there in the course of his arguments are always interesting.

Opposed to this, however, are long stretches of dull prose, recurring theological formulas always in the same words, repetitious sentences resulting from a combination of sources and, as mentioned, some passages which are nothing but a tangle. The most accurate description which can be given of the *Panarion*'s style is "uneven."

Many idioms in the *Panarion* are distinctive and, again, suggestive of oral Greek. There are periphrastic constructions with such verbs as σχεῖν, λαμβάνειν, ἀναδέχεσθαι, ποιεῖν. We find wordy noun locutions where another writer might have preferred a simple preposition: ἐν τῇ περὶ . . . περιτομῆς σχέσει for "in relation to circumcision"; even, if the text is in order, καθ' ἑκάστην ὑπόθεσιν λέξεως for "concerning each expression." μαχόμενοι θᾶτερον εἰς θᾶτερον πρός . . . means simply "inconsistent with"; τὸ πᾶν μέρος means "all of."

Words are not always used in the obvious senses which one would expect. μυθολόγημα, μυθολογία and μῦθος are synonyms, for example, and the two former are never found in the *Ancoratus*, a more formal treatise than the *Panarion*. πυργοποιία means, not the "building of the tower" but simply

the "tower (of Babel)," so that the "Scythians" κτίζουσι τὴν πυργοποιίαν. σχέσις, which often carries its common meaning of "relation," may also mean "kind, type" or even "occurrence." ὑπόθεσις, employed in several senses by Epiphanius, can also mean "kind, type." ὑπόνοια sometimes means "speculation." μοχθηρίαι are "bad arguments." A patristic dictionary will often document an unusual shade of meaning of some word with an example from Epiphanius—and that from the *Panarion* rather than from the *Ancoratus*.

While we do not know the reason for Epiphanius' distinctive vocabulary, a plausible explanation is that it is colloquial—not a demotic but an everyday Greek which some educated persons employed in discussing serious subjects. A study of the *Panarion*'s vocabulary by a Greek philologist might prove fruitful. As characterizations of the *Panarion*'s style, Holl's erhobenes Koine and the ungeschickt or Geschwätz of others seem equally wide of the mark. "Colloquial Koine" would answer best.

Epiphanius the Controversialist

Of all the church fathers, Epiphanius is the most generally disliked. It would be easy to assemble, from the writings of patrologists and historians of religion, a bill of particulars against him. He is a heresy hunter, a name caller and "nasty." His judgments are uncritical. His theology is shallow and his manner of holding it intransigent. Above all he vehemently opposed the teachings of the great commentator Origen, the first Christian systematic theologian and as a thinker far superior to Epiphanius.

As to the last charge, Origen had many opponents; Epiphanius only commanded the widest audience. Further, he admired some of Origen's achievements; his attack on him was not that of an obscurantist on an intellectual but that of a doctrinal purist on a teacher whom many considered heretical.

As to the epithet, "nasty," name calling was characteristic of controversial writings in the fourth century, though it must be admitted that Epiphanius carried it to extremes. He in fact apologizes for this in his first Proem. The terms of abuse he uses, he says, are his way of distancing himself from doctrines he abhors. Gnostics, whom he particularly abhorred, tend to be the objects of his least pleasant epithets; with others he can be a little more polite.

To the charge of uncritical judgment, an advocate of Epiphanius must allow him to plead guilty. Though he was a serious researcher he believed

the testimony he wanted to believe. When he had direct contact with his opponents, it was with the intent of convincing rather than of listening to them. He who is without this sin must cast the first stone.

As a theologian Epiphanius in no sense matches, say, the Cappadocian Fathers or even Athanasius. He can, however, be underrated. Though in the *Panarion* he again and again repeats the same doctrinal formulas, his discussion of the Holy Spirit's divinity shows careful thought. Epiphanius was not at home in philosophy and his quasi-philosophical arguments are generally inspired by others. He is, however, very proficient in scripture, and in the *Ancoratus* and elsewhere uses his proficiency to good effect.

Intransigence is characteristic of religious thought in most ages, and was certainly so in that of Epiphanius. His was the time of the bitter Arian controversy and his work was a product of it. In any case all sides in the fourth century held in common the premise that God's absolute truth was available, conveyed by an infallible scripture, and that to deny it was sinful and imperiled one's salvation. A century before Epiphanius Origen had written:

> I am of the opinion that it is indeed evil for one to err in his manner of life, but far worse to go astray in doctrines and not think in accordance with the most true rule of the scriptures. Since we are to be punished (for indulging) in moral sins, how much more when we sin because of false doctrines? For if a life of good morals sufficed men for salvation, why is it that many philosophers among the gentiles who live continently, and many among the heretics, can by no means be saved, as if the falseness of their doctrine obscured and sullied their manner of life?[13]

Gnostic writings themselves often exhibit the intransigence of their day; the *Gospel of Judas* furnishes us with an example.

Though Epiphanius devoted great effort to his battle against heresy this was by no means his sole interest. We have already noted that his *De Mensuris* and *De Gemmis* date from precisely the period in which he was most occupied with the Origenist controversy. Passages in the *Ancoratus* show us that he was a missionary; his continued connection with his monastery at Eleutheropolis, that he was a pastor. That his message was positive, not negative, can be seen in the opening chapters of the *Ancoratus*, where he

[13] Origen, Commentariorum in Matthaeum Series 33, (Klostermann p. 33). Author's translation.

promises his correspondents "neither to refuse nor to postpone" his answer concerning

> (Anc. 1,3) the teachings of the divine, sacred scripture with regard to the salvation which is among us, the firm foundation of our faith concerning Father, Son and Holy Spirit and all the rest of the salvation in Christ—I mean concerning the resurrection of the dead and the advent in the flesh of the Only-begotten, concerning both the old and the new covenants and, in general, the other supports of complete salvation.

To these imperatives Epiphanius devoted his life. His controversial writings are intended to teach them and to defend them from attacks which he considered perverse and dangerous.

As we have tried to show, the student of Nag Hammadi and other Gnostic literature needs Epiphanius and his fellow heresiologists in order to see the full picture of what was at stake. Beyond this, a church historian or historian of religion has several reasons for consulting this writer. As is well known he preserves documents which are not available elsewhere and is an important witness to the Greek text of Irenaeus and the events of the fourth century, in which he was a participant.

For another reason the historian needs to know something of him. His is the fourth century voice of what in our day we would call "fundamentalism." Nautin has said of him, Épiphane sera resté jusqu'à son dernier souffle un moine égyptien. Persons and schools of Epiphanius' kind have always had great influence, not only throughout Christian history but throughout that of all the great religions. To understand the past, and therefore the present, it is as necessary to know them as it is to know the great creative thinkers.

Footnotes

This volume's footnotes refer chiefly, either to patristic or to Gnostic literature. The former are intended to show both Epiphanius' sources and the places where the same information may be found in his contemporaries or near contemporaries; the latter, the manner in which he and Gnostic sources agree or disagree with each other.

The patristic notes are based on Holl's Sachapparat, though they usually refer to editions more recent that those used by Holl. We use Holl selectively, limiting our notes to the matters which seem most directly relevant; for further information Holl must be consulted. Our contribution, the Gnostic

notes, are references to passages in Nag Hammadi, the Berlin Gnostic Codex, the Codex Tchacos and the Askew and Bruce codices. They aim at completeness, but omissions will of course be found.

Occasionally we cite an interesting parallel from Manichean or Mandean literature, but the comparison of these with the Christian heresiologists must be made by specialists in these fields. Unfortunately, lack of space prevents our including many quotations in our notes; we must refer the readers to the patristic or Gnostic texts themselves. We provide indices of references. We hope that this book will prove to be a useful aid in historical study and scholarship.

Frank Williams
Las Cruces, NM, USA
March 24, 2007

EDITIONS AND WORKS CONSULTED

Adriaen, Mark, *S. Hieronymi presbyteri commentariorum in Esaiam Libri I-XI, CC* 73, Turnholt, 1963

——, *Commentarii in Prophetas Minores, CC* 76, 1969

Aland, Barbara, "Gnosis" in Aland, Barbara ed., *Festschrift für Hans Jonas*, Göttingen, 1977, pp. 209-215

Allberry, C. R. C., *A Manichean Psalm Book*, Stuttgart, 1938

Amidon, Philip, *The Panarion of St. Epiphanius of Salamis, Selected Passages*, Oxford, 1990

Attridge, Harold W., ed., *Nag Hammadi Codex I, Texts and Translations*, Leiden, 1985

Bauer, Adolf and Helm, Rudolf, *Hippolytus Werke: Die Chronik, GCS*, Berlin, 1955

Benko, S., "The Libertine Gnostic Sect of the Phibionites according to Epiphanius" in VC 21 (1967), pp. 103-119

Biddle, M., "The First Epistle of Clement on Virginity" in Roberts, Alexander and Donaldson, James edd., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* VIII, Grand Rapids, 1951, pp. 55-60

Böhlig, Alexander and Wisse, Frederik, *Nag Hammadi Codex III,2 and IV,2, The Gospel of the Egyptians*, Grand Rapids, 1975

Borret, Marcel, *Origene contre Celse, livres I et II, SC* 132; *livres V et VI, SC* 132, 147, Paris, 1967, 1969

Canellis, A. *Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi, CC* 79B, Turnholt, 2000

Charlesworth, James H., ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* II, New York, 1985

Cohen, Martin Samuel, *Shi'ur Qomah, Texts and Recensions*, Tübingen, 1983

Crouzel, Henri and Simonetti, Manlio, *Origene, traité des princips, SC*, Paris, 1978, 1980

Dechow, Jon, *Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity, Epiphanius of Cyprus and the Legacy of Origen*, Macon, GA, 1998

Dekkers, E., Tertullian, *Apologetum, CC* I, p. 85f

Dietrich, Albrecht, *Abraxas*, Teubner, 1891

Dummer, Jürgen, "Die Angaben über das gnostische Literatur bei Epiphanius Panarion" in *Koptische Studien in der DDR*, Halle, 1965, pp. 191-219

Emmel, Stephen, ed., *Nag Hammadi Codex II,5, The Dialogue of the Savior*, Leiden, 1984

Fraenkel, P., "Histoire sainte et hérésie chez Sainte Épiphane de Salamine, d'après le Tome I du *Panarion*", in *Revue de théologie et de philosophie* 12 (1962), pp. 175-191
Freedman, Simon M., *Midrash Rabbah* I, London, 1983
Gardner, Iain, *The Kephalaia of the Teacher*, Leiden, 1995
Grant, Robert M., *Theophilus of Antioch ad Autolycum*, Oxford, 1970
Gressmann, Hugo, rev. Laminski, Adolf, *Eusebius Werke, Die Theophanie, GCS*, Leipzig, 1904,
Guillaumont, Antoine, *Le 'Kephalaia Gnostica' d'Evagre le Pontique, et l'histoire de l'origenisme chez les grecs et chez les syriens*, Paris, 1962
Havelaar, Henriette W., *The Coptic Apocalypse of Peter (Nag Hammadi-Codex VI,3)*, Berlin, 1999
Helm, Rudolf, *Die Chronik des Hieronymos, GCS*, Berlin, 1956
Hennecke, Edgar and Schneemelcher, William, *New Testament Apocrypha*, Louisville, 1991
Hilgenfeld, A, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums* 1885, repr. Hildesheim, 1963
Holl, Karl, *Ancoratus. Panarion (haereses 1-33)*, Leipzig, 1915
——, rev. Dummer, Jürgen, *Epiphanius II: Panarion (haereses 34-46), GCS*, Berlin, 1980
——, rev. Dummer, Jürgen, *Epiphanius III: Panarion (haereses 65-80). De Fide*, *GCS*, Berlin, 1985
——, rev. Collatz, Friedrich-Christian et al., *Register zu den Bänden I-III (Ancoratus, Panarion 1-80, De Fide)*, *GCS*, Berlin, 2006
——, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Epiphanios (Ancoratus und Panarion)*, Leipzig, 1910
——, "Die Schriften des Epiphanius gegen die Bilderverehrung," in *Gesämmelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte* II, Tübingen, 1928, pp. 351-398
James, Montague Rhodes, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, Oxford, 1960
Janssens, Yvonne, *La Prôtennoia trimorphe*, *NHC XIII,1*, Quebec, 1978
Kaisers, Ursula Ulrike, *Die Hypostase der Archonten (Nag-Hammadi-Codex II,4)*, Berlin, 2006
Karst, Josef, *Die Chronik aus dem Armenischen übersetzt mit kritischem Commentar*, Leipzig, 1911
Kasser, Rodolphe, Meyer, Marvin, Wurst, Gregor, *The Gospel of Judas*, Washington, 2006
Kennedy, George A., *Greek Rhetoric under the Christian Emperors*, Princeton, 1983
Kirchner, Dankwart, *Epistula Jacobi Apocrypha, die zweite Schrift aus Nag Hammadi Codex I,2*, Berlin, 1989

Klijn, Albertus Frederik Johannes and Rinnick G. J., *Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects*, Leiden, 1973
Klostermann, Erich, rev. Treu, Ursula, *Originis Matthäuserklärung, Die lateinische Übersetzung der Commentatorium Series, GCS*, Berlin, 1976
——, rev. Nautin, Pierre, *Jeremiahomilien, Klagelieder Kommentar, Erklärung der Samuel und Königsbücher, GCS* 3, Berlin, 1983
Kroymann, Aemilian, Tertullian, Adversus Valentianos, *CC* 1, Turnholt, 1954, p. 441f
——, Adversus Marcionem, *CC* 1, p. 437f
——, Adversus Valentianos, *CC* 2, Turnholt, 1954, p. 751f
——, Adversus Omnes Haereses *CC* 2, p. 1339f
Layton, Bentley, ed., *Nag Hammadi Codex II,2-7 together with XIII,2*, Leiden, 1989
Lidzbarski, Mark, *Ginza, der Schatz, oder das Grosse Buch der Mandäer*, Leipzig, 1925
——, *Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer*, Berlin, 1966
Lipsius, Richard Adelbert, *Zur Quellengeschichte des Epiphanius*, Wien, 1865
MacDermot, Violet, *Pistis Sophia: Text Established by Carl Schmidt, Translation and Notes by Violet MacDermot*, Leiden, 1978
——, *The Books of Jeu and the Untitled Text in the Bruce Codex*, Leiden, 1978
Marcovich, Miroslav, *Hipppolytus Refutatio Omnium Haeresium, PT*, Berlin, 1986
——, *Justini Martyris Apologiae, PT* 38, Leipzig, 1994
——, *Justini Martyris dialogus cum Tryphone, PT 47*, Berlin, 1997
Marcus, Ralph, *Josephus, Jewish Antiquities, Books XII-XIV*, Cambridge, 1961
Metzger, Marcel, *Les constitutions apostoliques, SC* 320, 336, 339, Paris, 1985
Montsoulas, E., "Der Begriff 'Häresis' bei Epiphanius von Salamis," in *Studia Patristica* VII (TU 92), Berlin, 1966
Morard, Francoise, *L'Apocalypse d'Adam*, Quebec, 1985
Moreschini, C., *Hieronymi Presbyteris Dialogus contra Pelagianos, CC* 80, Turnholt, 1990
Nautin, Pierre, "Sainte Epiphane de Salamine," in DHGE 15, Paris, 1965, pp. 175-191
——, *Hippolyte et Josipe*, Paris, 1947
Nock, A. D. And Festugière, A.-J., *Corpus Hermeticum vol. I*, Paris, 1972
——, *Vol. II, XIII-XVIII and Asclepius*, Paris, 1973
Parrott, Douglas M., ed., *Nag Hammadi Codices V,2-5 and VI, with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502,1 and 4*, Leiden, 1979
Pearson, Birger A., ed., *Nag Hammadi Codex VII*, Leiden, 1996
——, *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, Leiden, 1981

Porter, Stanley E, ed., *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period*, Leiden, 2002

Pourkier, Aline, *L'hérésiologie chez Epiphane de Salamine*, Paris, 1988

Quasten, Johannes, "Epiphanius of Salamis" in *Patrology* III, Utrecht, 1986, pp. 384-396

Raspanti, Giacomo, *S. Hieronymi Presbyteris in Epistulam Pauli Apostoli ad Galatos, CC* 77A, Turnholt, 2006

Rehm, Bernard, *Die Pseudoklementinen in Rufinus Übersetzung, GCS*, Berlin, 1965

Richardson, Ernest Cushing, *Hieronymus, Liber de Viris Illustribus, TU 14*, Berlin, 1896

Riggi, Carlo, "Il termine haeresis di Epifanio di Salamina" in *Salesianum* 29 (1967) pp. 3-37

——, "La Figura di Epifanio nel IV secolo" in *Salesianum* 93, pp. 86-107

Robinson, James M., ed., *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, San Francisco, 1988

Rousseau, Adelin and Doutreleau, Louis, *Irénée contre les hérésies, livre I, SC* 264, Paris, 1979; *livre III*, *SC* 211, 1974

Siegert, Folker, *Nag-Hammadi-Register*, Tübingen, 1982

Schenke, Hans-Martin, *Der Gott, "Mensch" in der Gnosis*, Göttingen, 1962

——, "Die Relevanz der Kirchenväter für der Erschliessung der Nag-Hammadi Texte," in Irmscher and Treu, *Das Korpus der griechischen-christlichen Schriftsteller, Historie, Gegenwart, Zukunft*, Berlin, 1977

Schneemelcher, Wilhelm, "Epiphanius" in *RAC* 909-927

Scholem, Gershom, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkavah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition*, New York, 1965

Schwarz, Eduard, "Zwei Predigten Hippolyts," in *Sitzungssberichte der Bayrischen Akademie der Wissenschaft*, No. 3, München, 1936, pp. 32-38

Swartz, Michael D., *Mystical Prayer in Ancient Judaism: an Analysis of Ma'aseh Merkavah*

Stählin, Otto, rev. Frichtel, Ludwig, *Clemens Alexandrinus, GCS*, Berlin, 1960

——, *Stromata Books VII und VIII, Excerpta ex Theodoto, GCS*, Berlin, 1970

Strecker, Georg, *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudo-Klementinen*, Berlin, 1981

Tardieu, Michel, "Les Gnostiques," in *Tel Quel* 88, 1981

Thackeray, Henry St. John, *Josephus, Jewish War, Books I-III*, Cambridge, 1951

Unger, Dominic J., rev. Dillon, John J., *St. Irenaeus of Lyons against the Heresies*, New York, 1992

Van der Vliet, Jacques, "Judas and the Stars" in *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 36 (2006), pp. 137-152

Waldstein, Michael and Wisse, Frederik, *The Apocryphon of John*, Leiden, 1995

Waszink, J. H., Tertullian, De Anima, *CC* 2, p. 781f

Winkelmann, Friedhelm, *Eusebius, die Kirchengeschichte, GCS*, Berlin, 1999

Wisse, Frederick, "The Nag Hammadi Library and the Heresiologists" in VC 1972, pp. 205-233

Williams, Frank, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis, Book I, Sects 1-46*, Leiden, 1987, repr. 1997

——, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis, Books II and II, De Fide*, Leiden, 1994

ABBREVIATIONS

Adam. Rect. Fid.	Adamantius, *De Recta Fide*
Allog.	*Allogenes*
Apoc. Adam	*Apocalypse of Adam*
1 Apoc. Jas.	*First Apocalypse of James*
2 Apoc. Jas.	*Second Apocalypse of James*
Apoc. Paul	*Apocalypse of Paul*
Apoc. Pet.	*Apocalypse of Peter*
Apocry. Jas.	*Apocryphon of James*
Apocry. Jn.	*Apocryphon of John*
Asc.	*Asclepius*
Aug.	Augustine
Auth. Teach.	*Authoritative Teaching*
BG	Codex Berlinensis 8502
CC	*Corpus Christianorum*
CG	Cairo Gnostic documents
CD	*Covenant of Damascus*
1 Clem	*First Epistle of Clement*
Clem. Alex. Strom.	Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*
Exc. Theod.	*Excerpta ex Theodoto*
Clem. Hom.	Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*
Recog.	*Recognitions*
Cod. Tch.	Codex Tchacos
Const. Ap.	*Apostolic Constitutions*
Corp. Herm.	*Corpus Hermeticum*
Did.	*Didache*
DHGE	*Dictionaire de Géographie et Histoire Ecclésiastique*
Dia. Sav.	*Dialogue of the Savior*
Ep.	*Epistle*
Epist. Apost.	*Epistula Apostolorum*
Ep. Pet. ad Jac.	Pseudo-Clementine *Epistula Petri ad Jacobum*
Eug.	*Eugnostos*
Eus.	Eusebius
Chron.	*Chronicon*
H. E.	*Historia Ecclesiastica*
In Isa.	*Commentarium in Isaiam*
Praep. Ev.	*Praeparatio Evangelica*
Exeg. Soul	*Exegesis on the Soul*
Fil.	Filaster of Brescia
GCS	*Die griechischen-christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*
GT	*Gospel of Thomas*
Gos. Egyp.	*Gospel of the Egyptians*
Gos. Jud.	Codex Tchacos *Gospel of Judas*
Gos. Phil.	*Gospel of Philip*
Gos. Tr.	*Gospel of Truth*
Gr. Pow.	*The Concept of our Great Power*
Gr. Seth	*The Second Treatise of the Great Seth*
H-S	Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*

Hipp.	Hippolytus
Chron.	*Chronicle*
Refut.	*Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*
Synt.	*Syntagma*
Hyps.	*Hypsiphrone*
Inc.	*De Incarnatione*
Iren	Irenaeus, *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*
Jer.	Jerome
Adv. Jov.	*Adversus Jovinianum*
Chron.	*Chronicle*
C. Pelag.	*Contra Pelagianos*
In Gal.	*Commentarium in Galatas*
Vir. Ill.	*De Viris Illustribus*
Vit. Paul.	*Vita Paulae*
Jub.	*Book of Jubilees*
Justin	Justin Martyr
Apol.	*Apology*
Dial.	*Dialogus cum Tryphone*
Let. Pet.	*Letter of Peter to Philip*
Man. Hom.	*Manichaean Homilies*
Man. Keph.	*Manichean Kephalaia*
Man. Ps.	*Manichean Psalms*
Mars.	*Marsanes*
Melch.	*Melchizedek*
Method. Conviv.	Methodius,*Convivium*
Nat. Arc.	*The Nature of the Archons*
NHC	Nag Hammadi codices
Or. Wld.	*The Origin of the World*
Orig.	Origen
Cels.	*Contra Celsum*
Com. in Matt. Ser.	*Commentariorum in Matthaeum Series*
Hom. in Sam. Frgt.	*Homilia in Samuelem Fragmentum*
In Gen. Hom.	*Commentarium in Genesim Homilia*
In Matt.	*Commentarium in Matthaeum*
Princ.	*De Principiis*
Pan.	*Panarion*
Para. Shem	*Paraphrase of Shem*
PS	*Pistis Sophia*
PsT	"Pseudo-Tertullian"
PT	*Patristic Texts*
1 Q apGen	*Genesis Apocryphon*, Qumran Cave 1
1 Q Serek	Serek scroll, Qumran Cave 1
1 Q W	War scroll, Qumran Cave 1
RAC	*Realenzyklopädie des antiken Christentums*
Test. Tr.	*Testimony of the Truth*
Tert.	Tertullian
Adv. Lucif.	*Adversus Luciferanios*
Adv. Marc.	*Adversus Marcionem*
Adv. Val.	*Adversus Valentianos*
Carn. Chr.	*De Carne Christi*
Praescr.	*Praecriptio Haereticorum*
Res. Mort.	*De Resurrectione Mortuorum*
Treat. Res.	*Treatise on the Resurrection*
VC	*Vigiliae Christianae*
Val. Exp.	*Valentinian Exposition*
Zost.	*Zostrianus*

LETTER OF ACACIUS AND PAUL

A letter written in the ninety-second year of the Diocletian era, the twelfth of the reign of Valentinian and Valens and the eighth of Gratian,[1] to Epiphanius of Eleutheropolis in Palestine, <some time> abbot in the country about Eleutheropolis, now bishop of the city of Constantia in the province of Cyprus, from the presbyters Acacius and Paul, archimandrites, that is, abbots in Chalcis and Beroea in Coelesyria. <They requested that he> write a complete heresiology and not only they, but many <others> as well, urged and practically compelled him to take up the task.

Greetings in the Lord from the archimandrites, Acacius, presbyter, and Paul, presbyter, to the most godly Father, the bishop Epiphanius, our master and most highly honored in every way.

1,1 A glimpse of your Reverence would suffice us, Father, by filling us with spiritual speech and implanting as much affection in us as has arisen in those who enjoy your acquaintance. (2) But by its heralding of the fragrance of the sweet odor of his words and deeds, fame, which runs before a disciple of the Savior, presses one to take one's fill of his words and thought. We ought to have come in person to partake of the grace which God has given to you, as to the apostles.

1,3 But since the journey is prohibited by bodily infirmity and distress, we are unable to come ourselves, fall prostrate at your feet, and hear and learn the sacred, spiritual words as they issue from your lips. (4) (For we are confident that if we came and heard them, were we worthy, we would be set upon the way of life we have undertaken—provided that we are fit to attain its goal.)

1,5 Since infirmity has overtaken us, therefore, we beseech your Reverence in all your greatness not to grudge sharing with us the gifts you have truly been given by the Savior. (6) For not we alone, but all who hear of you, confess that the Savior has raised you up in this generation as a new apostle and herald, a new John, to proclaim the things that ought to be observed by those who have undertaken this course.

1,7 As Marcellus, a brother to us both, is pressed by your fame in its greatness and drawn by affection for your Reverence, and since he is a

[1] 376 A.D.

member of our community, we have employed his services, although he is a recent catechumen, for the making of such a long journey, and have committed to him the venture, in all its daring, of us sinners towards you, the Savior's disciple. (8) And our request is that you give us, for our instruction, some of the words you have spoken to certain brethren. For you, the righteous, this can be no burden but for us sinners it will be rejoicing in the Lord when we partake of them; for the load of our transgressions is lightened when we are filled with your spiritual uttterances. (9) We have heard names assigned to the sects by your Honor, and are asking your Reverence to tell us explicitly the heresy held by each of these cults. For <not> everyone's gift is the same.

1,10 We likewise ask you, the righteous, to pray to the Lord for all who long for you and are awaiting the gift from you. (11) We are in fasting and prayer that the brother of us all may be received gladly by your Honor and obtain the gift of your bestowing, and so offer the accustomed prayers to Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

1,12 All the brethren hope to be established by your prayer on their behalf. Since yours is a God-given grace of apostles we urge you to share it ungrudgingly. (13) All the little ones in the cloisters are praying the greater that they may enjoy a spiritual gift from your Reverence. May you remain well in the Lord, and happy in Christ and the Holy Spirit <as you administer> the throne that has been granted you and your God-given gift, till you receive the crown that awaits you.

PROEM I

Epiphanius' reply to the presbyters Acacius and Paul, concerning their letter to him about his writing an heresiology. (Proem I)

Greetings in the Lord from Epiphanius to his highly esteemed brothers and fellow-presbyters, Masters Acacius and Paul!

1,1 By drawing up a preface or opening statement as a sort of title, authors of old would give a glimpse, by means of the hint, of the entire work that followed. In the same style, beloved, I too am writing a preface for you, to give a brief summary of my <treatise> against sects. (2) Since I am going to tell you the names of the sects and expose their unlawful deeds like poisons and toxic substances, and at the same time match the antidotes with them as cures for those already bitten and preventatives for those who will have this misfortune, I am drafting this Preface for the scholarly to explain the "Panarion," or chest of remedies for those whom savage beasts have bitten. It is composed in three Books containing eighty Sects, symbolically represented by wild beasts or snakes.

1,3 But "one after the eighty" is at once the foundation, teaching and saving treatment of the truth and Christ's holy bride, the church. It has always been but was revealed in the course of time, through Christ's incarnation, in the midst of these sects. (4) I have made mention it in connection with the preaching of Christ and again, after all the iniquities of these sects, given a concise, clear account of it in accordance with the apostles' teaching, for the refreshment of those who by reading have labored their way through the sects.

2,1 Please, all you scholarly readers of the Preface, the Sects that follow it, and the Defense of the Truth and Exposition of the Truth and the Faith of the Holy Catholic Church: pardon me—who am only human and am trying my best, with hard labor and God-given zeal, to defend the true religion,—(2) if I <attempt> too much in my desire to make the best defense in my power, in the all-holy, all-august Name itself. For God allows me this, though I am investigating matters too difficult for me, since what I say is for the truth's sake, and my work is for the sake of true religion.

2,3 And I further beg your <pardon> if you should find—though it is certainly not my way to mock or ridicule people—but if, from zeal against the sects and for the readers' dissuasion, I may speak in anger or call certain persons "frauds," or "tramps" or "wretches." (4) The very necessity for the

words of the controversy is putting me in such a sweat, for the readers' dissuasion and to show that these persons' practices, rites and doctrines are the furthest thing from my mind, and thus prove my independence of them with the words and the bitterness of my opposition, and turn people away from them precisely by the words that appear too harsh.

3,1 And here are the contents of the entire work in its three Volumes, Volumes One, Two, and Three—which three Volumes I have divided into seven Sections with a certain number of Sects and Schisms in each section, making eighty in all. Their names and the occasions of them, are these: (2) The first, Barbarism. The second, Scythianism. The third, Hellenism. The fourth, Judaism. The fifth, Samaritanism. (3) Derived from these are the following. Before Christ's incarnation, but after Barbarism and the Scythian superstition, the sects which sprang from Hellenism are these: The sixth, Pythagoreans or Peripatetics, a sect which was separated (from Hellenism) by Aristotle. The seventh, Platonists. The eighth, Stoics. The ninth, Epicureans.

3,4 Then the Samaritan sect, an offshoot of Judaism, and its four peoples: The tenth, Gorothenes. The eleventh, Sebuaeans. The twelfth, Essenes. The thirteenth, Dositheans.

3,5 Then the afore-mentioned Judaism itself, which derived its character from Abraham, was amplified through the Law given to Moses, and inherited its name, "Judaism," from Judah the son of Jacob or Israel, through David, the king from the tribe of Judah. (6) And derived from Judaism itself are the following seven sects: The fourteenth, Scribes. The fifteenth, Pharisees. The sixteenth, Sadducees. The seventeenth, Hemerobaptists. The eighteenth, Ossaeans. The nineteenth, Nasaraeans. The twentieth, Herodians.

4,1 From these sects, and later on in the course of time, appeared the saving dispensation of our Lord Jesus Christ—that is to say, his incarnation, preaching of the Gospel, and proclamation of a kingdom. This alone is the fount of salvation, and the faith in the truth of the catholic, apostolic, and orthodox church.

4,2 From this the following sects, which have Christ's name only but not his faith, have been broken away and split off: (3) The first, Simonians. The second, Menandrians. The third, Satornilians. The fourth, Basilideans. The fifth, Nicolaitans. The sixth, Gnostics, who are also known as Stratiotics and are the same as the Phibionites, but some call them Secundians, others, Socratists, others, Zacchaeans, and by some they are called Coddians, Borborites, and Barbelists. The seventh, Carpocratians. The eighth, Cerinthians, also called Merinthians. The ninth, Nazoraeans. The tenth,

Ebionites. The eleventh, Valentinians. The twelfth, Secundians, with whom Epiphanes and Isidore are associated. The thirteenth, Ptolemaeans.

4,4 The fourteenth, Marcosians. The fifteenth, Colorbasians. The sixteenth, Heracleonites. The seventeeth, Ophites. The eighteenth, Cainites. The nineteenth, Sethians. The twentieth, Archontics. The twenty-first, Cerdonians. The twenty-second, Marcionites. The twenty-third, Lucianists. The twenty-fourth, Apelleans. The fwenty-fifth, Severians. The twenty-sixth, Tatianists.

4,5 The twenty-seventh, Encratites. The twenty-eighth, Phrygians, also known as Montanists and Tascodrugians. But again, these Tascodrugians are differentiated as a group in themselves. The twenty-ninth, Pepuzians, also known as Priscillianists and Quintillianists, with whom Artotyrites are associated. The thirtieth, Quartodecimans, who observe one day of the year as the Paschal festival. The thirty-first, Alogi, who do not accept the Gospel and Revelation of John. The thirty-second, Adamians. The thirty-third, Sampsaeans, also known as Elkasaites. The thirty-fourth, Theodotianists. The thirty-fifth, Melchizedekians. The thirty-sixth, Bardesianists. The thirty-seventh, Noetianists. The thirty-eighth, Valesians. The thirty-ninth, Catharists, also known as Navatians. The fortieth, Angelics. The forty-first, Apostolics, also known as Apotactics. The forty-second, Sabellians. The forty-third, Origenists who are also known as the immoral Origenists. The forty-fourth, Origenists who are also known as Followers of Adamantius.

4,6 The forty-fifth, Disciples of Paul of Samosata. The forty-sixth, Manichaeans, also known as Acuanites. The forty-seventh, Hierakites. The forty-eighth, Melitians, who are an Egyptian schism. The forty-ninth, Arians, also known as Ariomanites.

4,7 The fiftieth, The Audian schism. The fifty-first, Photinians. The fifty-second, Marcellians. The fifty-third, Semi-Arians. The fifty-fourth, Pneumatomachi, also called Macedonians and Disciples of Eleusius, who blaspheme the Holy Spirit of God. The fifty-fifth, Aërians. The fifty-sixth, Aetians, also called Anhomoeans, with whom Eunomius, or rather, "Anomus," is associated.

4,8 The fifty-seventh, Dimoirites, who do not confess Christ's incarnation in the full sense, also called Apollinarians. The fifty-eighth, those who say that St. Mary, the ever-virgin, had intercourse with Joseph after giving birth to the Savior. Such people I have called "Antidicomarians." The fifty-ninth, those who offer a loaf in the name of the Virgin Mary, who are called Collyridians. The sixtieth, Massalians, with whom the Martyrians, who are of pagan origin,and the Euphemites and Satanists, are associated.

5,1 Now I go back to the beginning again, divide these sects by volume and indicate, in this one of my summaries, how many of the eighty sects are contained in the first Volume, and so on through the second and the third, and also, for each of the seven Sections which have been arranged in the three Volumes, how many Sects are to be found in it. Thus:

5,2 In the first Volume there are three Sections and forty-six Sects, including <their mothers and the original> names for them, I mean Barbarism, Scythianism, Hellenism, Judaism and Samaritanism. In the second Volume there are two Sections and twenty-three Sects. And in the third Volume there are two Sections and eleven Sects.

5,3 In the first Section of the first Volume there are twenty Sects, as follows: Barbarism, Scythianism, Hellenism and Judaism. Varieties of Hellenes: Pythagoreans or Peripatetics, Platonists, Stoics, Epicureans. The Samaritan sect, which is derived from Judaism. Four Samaritan peoples, as follows: Gorothenes, Sebuaeans, Essenes, Dositheans. Seven Jewish sects as follows: Scribes, Pharisees, Sadducees, Hemerobaptists, Ossaeans, Nasaraeans, Herodians.

5,4 There are likewise thirteen Sects in the second Section of the first Volume, as follows: Simonians; Menandrians; Satornilians; Basilideans; Nicolaitans; Gnostics, also called Stratiotics and Phibionites, but Secundians by some, Socratists by others, Zacchaeans, Coddians, Borborites and Barbelists by others; Carpocratians; Cerinthians, also called Merinthians; Nazoraeans; Ebionites; Valentinians; Secundians, with whom Epiphanes and Isidore are associated; Ptolemaeans.

5,5 In the third Section of this first Volume there are thirteen Sects as follows: Marcosians; Colorbasians; Heracleonites; Ophites; Cainites; Sethians; Archontics; Cerdonians; Marcionites; Lucianists; Apelleans; Severians; Tatianists. This is the summary of the first Volume with its three Sections.

5,6 There are two Sections in the second Volume. And in the first Section of the second Volume—the fourth in numerical order from the beginning—there are eighteen Sects as follows: Encratites; Phrygians, also known as Montanists and Tascodrugians. But the Tascodrugians are differentiated from the (two) preceding. Pepuzians, <also known as Priscillianists> and Quintillianists, with whom Artotyrites are associated. Quartodecimans, who observe one day in the year as the Paschal fesstival; Alogi, who do not accept the Gospel and Revelation of John; Adamians; Sampsaeans, also known as Elkasaites: Theodotianists; Melchizedekians; Bardesianists; Noetians; Valesians; Catharists; Angelics; Apostolics, also known as Apo-

tactics, with whom the so-called Saccophori are associated; Sabellians; the immoral Origenists; the Origenists who follow Adamantius.

5,7 In the second Section of this second Volume which, counting as before, is the fifth, there are five Sects, as follows: Disciples of Paul of Samosata; Manichaeans, also known as Acuanites; Hierakites; Melitians, an Egyptian schism; Arians. And this is the summary of the second Volume, with its <two> Sections.

5,8 Similarly, there are also two Sections in the third Volume. In the first Section of the third Volume, the sixth according to the previous enumeration, there are seven Sects, as follows: Audians, a schism; Photinians; Marcellians; Semi-Arians; Pneumatomachi, who blaspheme the Holy Spirit of God; Aërians; Disciples of Aetius the Anhomoean, with whom Eunomius, also known as Anomus, is associated.

5,9 In the second Section of this Volume Three, seventh as we have enumerated the Sections—which is a seventh Section and the last in the work—there are four Sects as follows: Dimoirites, who do not confess Christ's incarnation in the full sense, also known as Apollinarians. Those who say that St. Mary, the ever-virgin, had intercourse with Joseph after giving birth to the Savior—I have called them "Antidicomarians." Those who offer a loaf in the name of Mary, and are called Collyridians. Massalians. And the brief defense of the orthodox faith and the truth, "The Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church."

This is the summary and superscription of the entire Treatise Against Eighty Sects, and one (further treatise), the Defense of the only Truth, that is "The Catholic and Orthodox Church." It is arranged in three Volumes below and divided into seven Sections.

ANACEPHALAEOSIS I

The following are contained in the first Section of the first Volume of the Refutation of the Sects <which includes twenty Sects> as follows:

First, the mothers and original names of all the sects, from which five mothers the others sprang. And these are the first four:

1,1 <1.> The first is Barbarism, a sect which is underived and lasted from Adam's time for ten generations until Noah. (2) It has been called Barbarism because the people of that time had no leader or common consensus. Everyone was in agreement with himself instead and served as a law for himself, according to the inclination of his own will.

2,1 <2.> A second is Scythianism, from the time of Noah, and afterwards until the building of the tower and Babylon, and for a few years after the time of the tower, that is until Peleg and Reu. (2) Since they bordered on the latitude of Europe these people were assimilated to Scythia and its peoples from the time of Terah, the ancestor of the Thracians, and afterwards.

3,1 <3.> A third is Hellenism, which began from the time of Serug,[1] through idolatry and people's adoption, each in accordance with some superstition, of a more civilized way of life, and of customs and laws.

3,2 However, when idols began to be set up, the various breeds of men made gods of <the leaders> they <were> then adopting, originally by painting pictures to portray the autocrats or sorcerers they had honored of old, or persons who had done something in the world that appeared memorable, <and excelled> in courage and strength of body. (3) But then, from the time of Terah[2] the father of Abraham, they also introduced the imposture of idolatry by means of statuary. They honored their ancestors, and those who had died before them, with images, first by making them with the potter's art and then by representing them through every craft—builders by carving stone, silversmiths and goldsmiths by crafting them with their media, and so with woodcarvers and the rest. (4) (The Egyptians, together with the Babylonians, Phrygians and Phoenicians, were the first to introduce this religion of image manufacture and mystery[3] rites. The greater part of

---

[1] Jub. 11.1-4
[2] Jub. 11.16; 12.2
[3] Jub. 11.16; 12.2

these were brought to the Hellenes from Cecrops'[4] time and onwards.) (5) Afterwards, and much later, they designated Cronus, Rhea, Zeus, Apollo and the rest as gods.

3,6 Hellenes are named for Hellen, who was one of the settlers of Hellas and gives the country his name. But as others tell it, it is named for the olive[5] that sprouted at Athens. (7) Actually the Ionians were the first of the Hellenes <and were named for> Iovan, one of the men who built the tower at the time when people's languages were divided. Thus they are all called Meropes as well, because of the "divided"[6] speech. (8) But afterwards, at a later period, Hellenism was made into sects—I mean the sects of Pythagoreans, Stoics, Platonists, Epicureans and the rest.

3,9 But the character of true religion[7] existed as did the natural law, and was practiced apart from these peoples, marking itself off amid Barbarism, Scythianism and Hellenism from the foundation of the world and onwards until it was combined with the true religion of Abraham.

<4.> And next after these came Judaism which received its character through circumcision from the time of Abraham and was expanded during the lifetime of Moses the seventh from Abraham, by the Law which was given by God through him, and which got its final name, "Judaism," from Judah the fourth son of Jacob surnamed Israel, through David, the first of this Judah's tribe to reign as king.

For it was plainly of these four sects that the apostle said as a reproof, "In Christ Jesus there is neither Barbarian, Scythian, Hellene nor Jew, but a new creation."[8]

Varieties of Hellenes:

5,1 <5.> Pythagoreans, or Peripatetics. Pythagoras taught the doctrines of the monad, providence, the prohibitions of sacrifice to the supposed gods and the eating of meat, and abstention from wine. (2) As well, he distinguished between what is above the moon, which he called immortal, and what is below it, which he called mortal. He taught the transmigrations of souls from body to body, even of beasts and insects, as well as the keeping of a five-year period of silence. Lastly he pronounced himself divine.

---

[4] Cecrops is mentioned at Eus. Praep. Ev. 10.9; Eus. Chron. (Karst p. 159); Jer. Chron. (Helm 21,24).

[5] ἐλαία

[6] μεμερισμένη

[7] θεοσεβεία. Or simply: piety. See 2,7. The author of the Anacephalaeosis is trying to emphasize, more strongly than does Epiph, that there is something distinctively heretical even about the four earliest sects which existed in the world without competition.

[8] Col 3:11

6,1 6. Platonists taught the doctrines of God; matter and form; that the world is generate and perishable, while the soul is ingenerate, immortal and divine; that the soul has three parts, the rational, the emotional and the appetitive; (2) that wives are common to all and that no one has one spouse of his own, but that anyone who wishes may have intercourse with any women who are willing; likewise the transmigrations of souls into various bodies, even those of insects; but at the same time, also, the origin of many gods from the one.

7,1 7. Stoics, who held that the universe is a body and believed that this visible world is God; and some declared that it has received its nature from the substance of fire. (2) They also define God as "mind," and like a soul of the whole existent vault of heaven and earth. And the universe is a body, as I said, and the luminaries are his eyes. The flesh of all things perishes, and the soul is transferred from body to body.

8,1 8. Epicureans supposed that indivisible and simple bodies, homogeneous and infinite in number, are the first principle of all things. And they held that pleasure is the consummation of happiness, and that neither God nor providence orders affairs.

9,1 9. Samaritanism and the Samaritans who derive from it, which is derived from Judaism. The occasion for it came at the time of Nebuchadnezzar and the captivity of the Jews, before the establishment of sects among the Greeks and the rise of their doctrines, but after there was a Greek religion, and midway through the period of Judaism. (2) Samaritans were immigrants from Assyria to Judaea and had received only Moses' Pentateuch, since the king had sent it to them from Babylon by a priest named Ezra. (3) All their opinions are the same as the Jews', except that they abominate gentiles and will not even touch any, and except that they deny the resurrection of the dead and the other prophecies, the ones subsequent to Moses.

Four Samaritan peoples:

10,1 10. Gorothenes, who celebrate the festivals at different times of year than the Sebuaeans.

11,1 11. Sebuaeans, who differ from the Gorothenes for the same reason, the festivals.

12,1 12. Essenes, who are not opposed to either party and celebrate without distinction with anyone they happen to be with

13,1 13. Dositheans, who follow the same customs as the Samaritans—circumcision, the Sabbath and the rest—and use the Pentateuch; but, going beyond the others, they abstain from meat and live a life of constant fasting. (2) And some are celibate as well, while others practice continence. And they believe in the resurrection of the dead, an idea which is foreign to Samaritans.

Seven Jewish sects:

14,1 14. Scribes, who were persons learned in the Law and persons who repeated the traditions of their elders. Because of their extra would-be religion they observed customs which they had not learned through the Law but had formulated for themselves, observances of the ordinance of the legislation.

15,1 15. Pharisees, meaning "persons set apart," whose lives were most exemplary and who were, if you please, more highly regarded than the others. They believed in the resurrection of the dead as the Scribes did, and agreed as to the existence of angels and the Holy Spirit. And they had a superior way of life: continence for a time, and celibacy; fasting twice a week; and cleansings of vessels, platters and goblets, (as was the case with the Scribes); (2) tithes; first-fruits; constant prayer, and the would-be religious styles of dress with their shawls, their robes or rather tunics, the width of the "phylacteries," or borders of purple material, fringes, and tassels on the corners of the shawl. Things of this sort were signs of their periods of continence. And they also introduced the ideas of destiny and fate.

16,1 16. Sadducees, meaning "most righteous," who were descended from the Samaritans and from a priest named Zadok as well. They denied the resurrection of the dead and did not recognize the existence of angels or spirits. In all other respects they were Jews.

17,1 17. Hemerobaptists. These were Jews in all respects, but claimed that no one can attain eternal life unless he is baptized every day.

18,1 18. Ossenes, meaning "boldest."[9] They were observers of the Law's provisions but also made use of other scriptures after the Law, though they rejected most of the later prophets.

19,1 19. Nasaraeans, meaning "rebels," who forbid the eating of any meat and do not partake of living things at all. They have the holy names of patriarchs which are in the Pentateuch, up through Moses and Joshua the son of Nun, and they believe in them—(2) I mean Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the earliest ones, and Moses himself, and Aaron, and Joshua. But they hold that the scriptures of the Pentateuch are not Moses' scriptures, and maintain that they have others besides these.

20,1 20. Herodians, who were Jews in all respects, but thought that Herod was Christ, and awarded the honor and name of Christ to him.

This is the first Section, containing refutations of all of these twenty sects. The subject of Christ's advent is in it as well, and the confession of the truth.

---

[9] Or: the most headstrong

The Heresiology of Epiphanius, Bishop, Entitled "Panarion," or "Medicine Chest" (Proem II)[1]

1,1 As I begin my account and discussion of faith and unbelief, of correct views and divergent views, I am going to start by mentioning the world's creation and what followed it[2]—though I am not beginning by my own power or with my own reasoning but as God, the Lord of all, the Merciful, has vouchsafed to reveal the knowledge of everything to his prophets and through them, as far as human nature allows, to us.

1,2 And I feel quite anxious at the outset, as soon as I begin to consider the subject. Indeed I am extremely frightened at undertaking a task of no small difficulty, and I call on the holy God himself, on his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ, and on his Holy Spirit, to give light to my poor mind, for its illumination with the knowledge of these things.

1,3 For the Greek authors, poets and chroniclers would invoke a Muse when they undertook some work of mythology. A Muse, not God—their wisdom was devilish, "earthly, and not descended from above,"[3] as scripture says. (4) I, however, am calling upon the holy Lord of all to come to the aid of my poverty and inspire me with his Holy Spirit, so that I may include nothing spurious in my treatment of the subject. (5) And having made this very petition—for "according to the measure of faith and in proportion,"[4] I know my inadequacy—I beseech him to grant it.

2,1 To a person reading a work on any question the aim <of the treatise> ought to be <clear>—the discoveries which training enables my small mind to grasp lie in the temporal realm, and I certainly do not promise <to impart the knowledge> of everything in the world. (2) There are things which cannot be uttered, and things which can. There are things untold, beyond counting, inaccessible so far as man is concerned, and known only to the Lord of all. (3) But we are dealing with variance of opinions and kinds of knowledge, with faith in God and unbelief, with sects, and with heretical human opinion which misguided persons have been sowing in the world from man's formation on earth till our own day, the eleventh year of the reigns of Valentinian and Valens and the seventh of Gratian's.[5]

---

[1] Epiph considers his account of the four "mothers" of the sects to be part of this Proem, as he shows by his wording of 2,13. For convenience we title 1,1-3,9 Proem II.

[2] At 1,1 below. Epiph's account begins with Adam.

[3] Jas 3:15

[4] Cf. Rom 12:6.

[5] 375 C.E.

2,4 Some of the things <about> sects and schisms which I shall be telling the reader, I owe to my fondness for study. Certain things I learned from hearsay, though I happened on some with my own ears and eyes. I am confident that I can give an account, from accurate report, of the origins and teachings of some sects, and part of the what goes on among the others. Of these latter, I know one from the works of ancient authors, another by listening to learned men who confirmed my notion precisely.

2,5 I did not gather all this reflection together on my own initiative, or by spending further time on subjects which go beyond my limited intelligence. In fact <I have also written> this work[6]—which, by God's will, I have consented to compose—<at the request> of scholarly persons who urged my weakness on at various times and in various ways, and practically forced me to get at it. Such a request your Honors made in writing, my most esteemed brothers and scholarly fellow presbyters, Acacius and Paul, in a letter of recommendation. (6) Now since, not without God's help, I have given the fullest consideration to the number of the requests, and from extreme love for the servants of God have consented to take the step, I shall begin—not with eloquence of language or any polished phrases, but with plain speech in a plain dialect,[7] but with accuracy of the facts my speech conveys.

3,1 The author Nicander too gave an account of the nature of beasts and reptiles. And other authors <described> the qualities of roots and plants—Dioscurides the Wood-Cutter, Pamphilus, King Mithridates, Callisthenes, Philo, Iolaus of Bithynia, Heraclidas of Tarentum, Cratenus the Root-Collector, Andrew, Bassus the Tulian, Niceratus, Petronius, Niger, Diodotus, and certain others. (2) In the same way I, in trying to reveal the roots and beliefs of the sects, am not <describing them> in order to harm those who care to read (my description). (3) Those authors made a diligent effort, not to point evil out, but to frighten people and ensure their safety, so that they would recognize the dreadful, dangerous beasts and be safe and escape them by God's power, by taking care not to engage with such deadly creatures if they encountered them, and were menaced by their breath or bite, or by the sight of them. And <at the same time>, from the same concern, the same authors prescribed remedies made from roots and plants, to counteract the evil of these serpents.

---

[6] In addition to the Ancoratus

[7] In other words, Epiph intends to write without rhetorical ornamentation, and in the Koine. Cf. what he says about "languages" at 42,12,1 elenchi 13 and 21.

3,4 Thus, dearest, my work too <has been compiled> as a defense against them and for your <safety>, to reveal the appearance of the dreadful serpents and beasts, and their poisons and deadly bites. (5) And to correspond with these I shall give as many arguments, like antidotes, as I can in short compass—one or two at most—to counteract their poison and, after the Lord, cure anyone who wants <to be cured>, if he has fallen, willingly or inadvertently, into these snake-like teachings of the sects.

1.
<*Barbarism*>

1,1 For at the beginning Adam was brought to life on the sixth day, after being formed from earth and infused with (God's breath). He was not begun on the fifth day, as some think, and finished on the sixth; the idea of those who say this is a mistaken one. He was unspoiled and innocent of evil and had no other name, for he had no additional name of an opinion, a belief, or a distinctive way of life. He was simply called "Adam," which means "man." (2) A wife like himself was formed for him out of himself—out of the same body, <by> the same infusion of breath. Adam had male and female children, and after 930 years of life he died.

1,3 The child of Adam was Seth, the son of Seth was Enosh, and his descendants were Cainan, Mahalaleel and Jared. And the tradition which I have learned says that wickedness first appeared in the world at this point.[1] It had also appeared at the beginning through Adam's disobedience, and then through Cain's fratricide. But now, in the lifetime of Jared and afterward, came sorcery, witchcraft, licentiousness, adultery and injustice. (4) <However> there was no divergent opinion, no changed belief; there was one language, and one stock which had been planted on earth at that time. (5) This Jared had a son named Enoch, who "pleased God and was not; for god took him away" and he "did not see death."[2] Enoch was the father of Methuselah, Methuselah of Lamech, and Lamech of Noah

1,6 God's righteous judgment brought a flood on the world and wiped all humanity out, and all other <living things>. But by his decree he preserved Noah in the ark, since he had pleased God and found favor—Noah himself; his three sons, Shem, Ham and Japheth; Noah's own wife; and his three sons' wives. (7) So eight human beings were preserved from the water

[1] Perhaps cf. Jub. 4.15, which says that the Watchers came to earth in the days of Jared.
[2] Gen 5:24; Heb 11:5

of the flood in the ark of those days. And some of every kind of animal and living thing, cattle and everything else on earth, were preserved—pairs in some cases, sevens in others—to renew the existence of every kind of thing in the world. (8) And thus a tenth generation had passed making 2262 years.[3] And the flood came to an end, and Noah and his household served as a surviving stock in the world.

1,9 But there was no difference of opinion yet, no people that was at all different, no name for a sect, and no idolatry either. Since everyone followed his own opinion, however, the name, "Barbarism," was given to the era then, during the ten generations. (For there was not one law. Everyone served as a law to himself and conformed to his own opinion. Hence the apostle's usage, not only of "Barbarism" but of the other terms as well; for he says, "In Christ Jesus there is neither Barbarian, Scythian, Hellene nor Jew.")[4]

2.
< *Scythianism* >

2,1 After the flood, since Noah's ark had come to rest in the highlands of Ararat between Armenia and Cardyaei on the mountain called Lubar,[1] the first human settlement following the flood was made there. And there the prophet Noah planted a vineyard and became the original settler of the site. (2) His children—there is no indication that he had more—had children and children's children down to a fifth generation, 659 years in all, omitting Shem. But I shall list the descendants of the one son in succession. Shem, then, was the father of Arphachshad; Arphachshad, of Kenah; Kenah, of Shelah. Shelah was the father of Eber, the pious and godfearing. Eber was the father of Peleg.[2]

2,3 And there was nothing on earth, no sect, no opinion clashing with another one, but only "men" were spoken of, "of one speech and one language."[3] There were only ungodliness and godliness, the natural law and the natural error of each individual's will, not learned from teaching or writings. There was no Judaism, no Hellenism, no other sect at all. But in

---

[3] Cf. Jer. Ep. (Epiph/John of Jerusalem) 51.6.7.
[4] Col 3:11; Gal 3:28

[1] Jub. 5.28; 7.1; 17, and 10.15. In this last, Lubar is said to be Noah's burial place.
[2] Gen 11:10-17
[3] Gen 11:1

a sense there was the faith which is now native to God's present day holy catholic church, a faith which was in existence from the beginning and was revealed again later. (4) Anyone who is willing <to make an> impartial <investigation can> see, from the very object of it, <that> the holy catholic church is the beginning of everything. Adam, <the> man who was formed at the first, was not formed with a body circumcised, but uncircumcised. He was no idolater, and he knew the Father as God, and the Son and Holy Spirit, for he was a prophet.

2,5 Without circumcision he was no Jew and since he did not worship carved images or anything else, he was no idolater. For Adam <was> a prophet, and knew that the Father had said, "Let us make man,"[4] to the Son. What was he, then, since he was neither circumcised nor an idolater—except that he exhibited the character of Christianity? (6) And we must take this to be the case of Abel, Seth, Enosh, Enoch, Methuselah, Noah and Eber, down to Abraham.

2,7 Godliness and ungodliness, faith and unbelief, were operative then—a faith which exhibited the image of Christianity and an unbelief which exhibited the character of ungodliness and transgression, contrary to the natural law, until the time I have just mentioned.

2,8 In the fifth generation after the flood, now when humanity was multiplying from Noah's three sons, through the succession of children's children and their children a total of 72 founding fathers and chieftains had arisen in the world. (9) And in going on and advancing from Mt. Lubar and the borders of Armenia, that is, from the land of Ararat, they arrived at the plain of Shinar where, we suppose, they chose to <settle>. Shinar is now in Persia but anciently it belonged to the Assyrians.

2,10 Consulting together there they took counsel with each other to build a tower and a city. Because they had migrated to Asia from the region next to Europe they were all called Scythians in the parlance of the time.

2,11 They laid the foundations of the tower and built Babylon. And God was not pleased with their foolish work, for he confounded their languages and divided them from one to 72, to correspond with the number of the men who were then alive. Thus they have been called Meropes because of the divided speech.[5] A blast of wind blew the tower over.

---

[4] Gen 1:26

[5] μεμερισμένοι

2,12 And so they were divided right and left over the whole earth, some returning to the place from which they had set out and some going to the east ahead of them, but others reached Libya. (13) Thus, if anyone wanted to determine the precise facts about these people he could find, in the case of each country, how each received his allotment. Thus Mistrem was allotted Egypt, Cush Ethiopia, Put Axumis, Ragman and Sabteka and <Dedan, also called Judad>, the region bordering on Garama. But not to go on too long in the composition of this preface here, I shall return to the subject and again take up the order in succession.

3.
<*Hellenism*>

3,1 And then, during the time between Eber, and Peleg and the building of the tower and the first city after the flood—which was founded in its actual building—came the beginning of the taking of counsel, and of autocracy. (2) For Nimrod[1] the son of Cush the Ethiopian, the father of Asshur, ruled as a king. His kingdom arose in Orech, Arphal and Chalana, and he also founded Tiras, Tubal and Laban in Assyria. The Greeks say that this is the Zoroaster who went on further to the east and became the original settler of Bactria

3,3 The world's transgressions were spread abroad from there, for Nimrod was the originator of wrong doctrine, astrology and magic—which is what some say of Zoroaster.[2] But in actual fact this was the time of Nimrod the giant; the two, Nimrod and Zoroaster, are far apart in time.

3,4 Peleg was the father of Reu, and Reu was the father of Serug, which means "provocation"; and, as I have been taught, idolatry and Hellenism began among men with him.[3] It was not with carved images yet, or with reliefs in stone, wood or silver-plated substances, or ones made <of> gold or any other material, that the human reason invented evil for itself and, with its freedom, reason and intellect, invented transgression instead of goodness, but only with paintings and portraits.

3,5 Nahor was born as a son to Serug and became the father of Terah. The making of images with clay and pottery began at this point, with the

---

[1] "Zoroaster the magus" is ruler of Bactria at Jer. Chron. 20,13 (Helm).

[2] For Nimrod as a magician, identified with Zoroaster, cf. Clem. Hom. 9.4-5.

[3] Idolatry begins with Serug at Jub. 11.1-6, but Jub. 11.14-17 and 12.1-8; 12-14 ascribe it to Terah.

art of this Terah. And with him the world arrived at its twentieth generation, comprising 3332 years.

3,6 And of the earlier men no one died before his father;[4] fathers died before their children and left their sons to succeed them. (Never mind Abel—he did not die a natural death.) (7) But since Terah had set up a rival to God by making one with his own pottery he was rightly repaid with the like of what he had done and was provoked to jealousy himself, through his own son. (8) Hence sacred scripture remarked with astonishment, "And Haran died before the eyes of his father, Terah, in the land of his nativity."[5]

3,9 A kind of succession of Scythianism, and the name for it, remained in being until his time, but there was no such thing as a sect yet, no device other than simply a "<first> fornication, thinking on idols."[6] And after that people made gods of wretched despots, or sorcerers who had deceived the world, by honoring their tombs. (10) And much later they made Cronus, and Zeus, Rhea, Hera and the rest of them into gods, and then they made one by worshiping Acinaces—and the Scythian Sauromatians made gods by worshiping Odrysus and the ancestor of the Thracians, from whom the Phrygian people are derived. This is why Thracians are named for the person called Thera, who was born during the building of the tower.

3,11 When error had its beginning history had arrived at the point I have indicated. <Hellenism began with the Egyptians, Babylonians and Phrygians>, and then made a hash of <men's> ways. After that historians and chroniclers borrowed from the imposture of the Egyptians' heathen mythology <and conveyed it to the other nations>, and this was how sorcery and witchcraft were invented. (12) These things were brought to the Greeks from the time of Cecrops. And at this time Ninus and Semiramis, Abraham's contemporaries, were living in Assyria, and it was the sixteenth Egyptian dynasty. But the only kings then were the kings of Sicyon,[7] the kingdom founded by Europs.

---

[4] Cf. Clem. Recog. 1.31.3 where, however, the crime for which Terah is punished is incest.

[5] Gen 11:28

[6] Cf. Wisd Sol 14:12.

[7] This chronological information comes from Eus. Chron. 42a,28 (Helm); cf. Jer. Chron. 16,2-17 (Helm).

4.
<*Judaism*>

1,1 And God chose Abraham who—again, characteristically of the holy catholic church—was faithful in uncircumcision, and was perfection itself in godliness, a prophet in knowledge, and in life, conformed to the Gospel. (2) For he had lived at home to honor his father <but>, like Peter, Andrew, James and John, he bade farewell to his family when he was called by God's bidding, in obedience to the One who was calling him.

1,3 And to avoid prolonging the account again, I am going to summarize. On reaching the age of 99 this patriarch was given the commandment of circumcision by God, and the character of Judaism originated from this, after Hellenism. And it was the twenty-first generation, 3431 years, <after> the foundation of the world. (4) For from the flood till the tower and Serug there was Scythianism, and there was Hellenism from Serug till Abraham—and until now. But there was no name of a sect derived from Abraham, other than simply the name of his godly self; and so those who were derived from Abraham were called Abramians.

1,5 For Abraham had eight sons, but Isaac was the sole heir. This was both because, as his father wished, he was living as an adherent of the true religion, and because he had been given to his father by God's promise. (6) Before him Abraham had Ishmael by the maidservant Hagar, and Khetura bore him six children. These were dispersed over the land called Arabia Felix—Zimram, Jokshan, Ishbak, Shuah, Medan and Midian. And the "son of the bondmaid"[1]—as I said, his name was Ishmael—also took up residence in <the wilderness> and founded the city called Paran in the wilderness. He had twelve children altogether; these were the ancestors of the tribes of the Hagarenes, or Ishmaelites, though today they are called Saracens.

1,8 Isaac had two sons, Esau and Jacob, and then the nation of the godly were called both Abramians and Isaacites. When Esau had gone off to Idumaea, the territory lying to the southeast of Canaan, he became the original settler of Mount Seir, and in his turn founded Edom, known as Rekem and Petra. (9) He had sons who were also called the "princes of Edom,"[2] and they ruled, each in turn, in Idumaea. The fifth in succession from him, leaving Abraham out of this number but counting from Isaac,

[1] Gal 4:30
[2] Cf. Exod 15:15.

was Job. (10) For Isaac was the father of Esau, Esau of Raguel, Raguel of Zara, and Zara of Job, who was called Jobab earlier, but was later named Job, shortly before the trial that came upon him. Circumcision was the custom (of all these persons).

1,11 By his father's and mother's advice Jacob fled from his brother Esau because of Esau's anger, to Padan in Mesopotamia beyond Souba in Mesopotamia. From there he took four wives in all of his own kin, and they bore him twelve children, also called "the patriarchs." (12) During his return to Canaan, to his father, Isaac, and his mother, Rebecca, he had a vision from God near the sources of the Jordan—the stream is called the Jabbok—perhaps where he had seen hosts of angels. (13) "And lo," we are told, "(there appeared) a man"—by which the scripture meant an angel—"at even, and wrestled with him until the breaking of the day."[3] As a blessing he gave Jacob a title of honor, "Israel." (14) When he left there Jacob named the place, "Sight of God." <Now> since the One who told him, "Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel shall it be called,"[4] <had named him Israel>, and had distinguished him by saying, "Thou hast had power with God, and with men thou shalt be mighty,"[5] they have been called Israelites from that time on.

2,1 Israel too went down to Egypt after Joseph's descent—he too, with his whole household of sons and grandsons, the wives we have spoken of and others, 70 souls in all. (2) The people of Israel lived in Egypt for five generations. For Jacob was the father of Levi and Judah and the other ten patriarchs; Levi was the father of Kohath; Judah of Pharez. Kohath was the father of Amram; Amram was the father of Moses. Pharez was the father of Esrom; Esrom was the father of Aram; Aram was the father of Aminadab, and Aminadab was the father of Nahshon.

2,3 During the lifetime of Moses and Nahshon, in the fifth generation reckoned from Levi, Israel departed miraculously from Egypt through the Red Sea, and encamped in the wilderness of Sinai. (4) And when God directed his servant Moses to make a count of men between 20 and 50 who could draw a sword and bear arms, he found as many as 628,500.

2,5 Inachus[6] was well known among the Greeks at that period. His daughter was Io, also called Atthis, for whom the present day Attica[7] is

---

[3] Cf. Gen 32:30.
[4] Gen 32:28
[5] Gen 32:28
[6] Clem. Alex. Strom. 1.102.4; Eus. Praep. Ev. 10.10; Jer. Chron. 7,20
[7] Jer. Chron. 44,1

named. Bosporus,[8] for whom the city of Bosporus on the Black Sea is named, was her son as well. The Egyptians call her Isis,[9] and also worship her as a goddess. Also with the same name as his is a river called Inachus.

2,6 It was then that the Greeks' mysteries and rites began. They had unfortunately been invented previously among the Egyptians, Phrygians, Phoenicians and Babylonians, but they were brought to the Greeks from Egypt by Cadmus,[10] and by Inachus himself—who had previously been named Apis, and had built Memphis.[11] They also originated with Orpheus and certain others (7) and were formed into heresies later, during the lifetimes of Epicurus, Zeno the Stoic, Pythagoras and Plato. These were in vogue from this time until the period of the Macedonians and Xerxes, king of Persia, after the first fall of Jerusalem and the captivity under Nebuchadnezzar and Darius, and the time of Alexander of Macedon's contemporaries. (8) For Plato was noted at that period, and his predecessors, Pythagoras and the later Epicurus. From this, as I said, the Greek writings got their impetus and reached their established form, and the philosophers' celebrated sects afterwards. These agree among themselves in error and produce a concordant science of idolatry, impiety and godlessness, but within the same error they clash with each other.

5.

Against Stoics. <Sect> three from Hellenism, but five of the series

1,1 And the Stoic notion of deity is as follows. They claim that God is mind, or the mind of the whole visible vault—I mean of heaven, earth and the rest—like a soul in a body. (2) But they also divide the one Godhead into many individual beings: sun, moon and stars, soul, air and the others. (3) And <they teach> the reincarnations of souls and their transmigrations from body to body, with <souls> being removed <from> bodies, entering others in turn and being born once more—along with much deceit of theirs they cap it all with this impiety. And they think that the soul is a part of God, and immortal.

1,4 Zeno was the founder of their Stoa, and there is much confused chatter about him. Some have said that he was <the son> of one Clean-

[8] Jer. Chron. 42,15
[9] Jer. Chron. 27,14
[10] Jer. Chron. 46,23
[11] Jer. Chron. 32,9

thes of Tyre. But others claim that he was a Citean, a Cypriote islander, and that he lived at Rome for a while but later advocated his doctrine at Athens, at the so-called Stoa. Some, however, say that there are two Zenos, Zeno of Elis and the one I have been speaking of. Both taught the same doctrine anyhow, even though there might be two of them. (5) He too, then, like the other sects, claims that matter is contemporaneous with God, and that there is a fate and fortune by which all things are directed and influenced.

1,6 Now then, I am going to <administer> a remedy for Zeno's condition, so far as this brief discussion of mine can do it. For rather than overloading the contents of the treatise, <I need only> give <the main points>. However, skimming the surface so as not to digress, I shall say to Zeno:

2,1 Where did you get the teaching of your doctrine, Mister? Or which Holy Spirit has spoken to you from heaven about your imposture? For you are obliged to say that two things, matter and God, are contemporary with each other. Your assertion will fall flat and prove untenable. (2) For you admit that someone whom you also call "almighty" is the creator, and you divide him into a plurality of gods. But what can he be the creator of, if matter is his contemporary? A matter which did not originate from any cause and is not subject to one must be its own master for itself. (3) And if the creator took his material from it and acquired it as a loan, this argues his weakness and must be a contribution which, due to his bankruptcy, has been made to a person who has not provided for the subsistence of his handiwork from his own resources, but from someone else's.

2,4 And there is a great deal wrong with your spurious notion of the transmigration of souls, you would-be sage with your promise of knowledge to humanity! For if the soul is part of God and immortal and yet you associate wretched bodies with its fashioning—not just <human> bodies, I suppose, but bodies of four-legged beasts and things that crawl and disgusting bugs—you associate them with the fashioning of the soul, which you say it has from God! And what could be worse?

3,1 You bring in fate besides, as though it is the cause of what happens to human and other beings. But your mythology is going to be refuted by one succinct argument. If wisdom, understanding, rationality and irrationality and everything else is brought about by fate, then forget about laws! Fate is in control of the adulterers and the others. Rather than the man, who acts under necessity, the stars which have imposed the necessity should pay the penalty.

3,2 Indeed I shall say some more about this, in another different way. No more diatribes! No more sophists, rhetoricians and grammarians, no more doctors and the other professions, and the countless manual trades! If it is fate that equips the educated and intelligent, no one should learn from a teacher. Let the thread-spinning Fates <weave> the knowledge by nature, as your imposture with its boastful oratory says.

6.
Platonists, Sect four from Hellenism, but six of the series

1,1 So much for Zeno and the Stoics. Although Plato tended in the same direction too <by his adherence to> reincarnation, the transmigration of souls, polytheism and the other idolatries and superstitions, he probably did not entirely agree with Zeno and the Stoics about matter. (2) For he himself knows God, and that all that is has been caused by the God who is.[1] But there is a first cause and a second and a third. And the first cause is God, but the second has been caused by God, <together with> certain powers. Through it and the powers matter has come into being.

1,3 For Plato makes the following claim: "Heaven came into being with time, and will thus be destroyed with it as well."[2] This is a revision of his own previous statements about matter. For at one time he too said that matter is contemporaneous with God.[3]

7.
Pythagoraeans, Sect five from Hellenism, but seven of the series

1,1 Pythagoras and the Peripatetics characterized God as one before Plato, but still adhered to other philosophies, and to the principles <of the philosophers I have been discussing>. Like them, Pythagoras and his followers in their turn proclaim the wicked, extremely impious doctrine of the immortalizations and transmigrations of souls and the dissolution of bodies.

1,2 Pythagoras finally died in Media. He says that God is a body, meaning heaven, and that the sun and the moon, the other stars, and the planets of heaven are God's eyes and his other features, as in a man.

---

[1] Plato Ep. 2, 312E
[2] Plato Timaeus, 37B
[3] Cf. Hipp. Refut. 1.19.6.

8.
Epicureans, Sect six from Hellenism, but eight of the series

1,1 Next after them, Epicurus introduced the world to the doctrine that there is no providence. He said that all things arise from atoms and revert back to atoms. All things, even the world, exist by chance, since nature is constantly generating, being used up again, and once more renewed out of itself—but it never ceases to be, since it arises out of itself and is worn down into itself.

1,2 Originally the entire universe was like an egg and the spirit was then coiled snakewise round the egg, and bound nature tightly like a wreath or girdle. (3) At one time it wanted to squeeze the entire matter, or nature, of all things more forcibly, and so divided all that existed into the two hemispheres and then, as the result of this, the atoms were separated. (4) For the light, finer parts of all nature—light, aether and the finest parts of the spirit—floated up on top. But the parts which were heaviest and like dregs have sunk downwards. This means earth—that is, anything dry—and the moist substance of the waters. (5) The whole moves of itself and by its own momentum with the revolution of the pole and stars, as though all things were still being driven by the snakelike spirit.[4]

I have spoken of these things if only in part, and in the same way these four sects ought to be refuted. <But this has been foregone> for the sake of shortness in reading.

(Judaism, continued)

2,1 And then as I have said already,[1] poets, prose authors, historians, astronomers, and the ones who introduced the other kinds of error made men's opinion giddy and confused by accustoming their minds to any number of bad cases and arguments. And this "first mistake" and misfortune of doctrine, "the invention of idols",[2] came into being.

2,2 Everything was divided into Hellenism and Judaism. However, it was not called Judaism yet, but until <five> persons had been born in succession it had the ancestral name of the true religion through Israel. (3) For Nahshon, who was born in the wilderness as head of the tribe of

[4] Cf. Ascl. 17.

[1] At 3,11
[2] Cf. Wisd Sol 14:12.

Judah, was the father of Salmon. Salmon was the father of Boaz; Boaz, of Obed; Obed of Jesse—while the godly were still being called Israelites. Jesse was the father of King David, the first of the tribe of Judah to reign as king. From him there then arose the successive kings of his line, one after another, with son succeeding father.

2,4 The actual first king in Israel before David himself, was Saul the son of Kish, of the tribe of Benjamin. <But he was rejected>, and no son succeeded him; his kingship passed to David and through David, the first, to the tribe of Judah. (5) For as a first child, Reuben was born to Jacob himself; as a second, Simeon; as a third, Levi, and as a fourth, Judah, and thus they are called Jews because of the tribe of Judah, with the name of the godly people changed in this way. Hence they were called (both) Israelites and Jews.

3,1 The four breeds on earth followed each other in succession until this time, with these four divisions distinguished from the earliest times until this one which I have mentioned here, and beyond. (2) That is: from Adam until Noah, Barbarism. From Noah until the tower, and until Serug two generations after the tower, the Scythian superstition. After that, from the tower, Serug and <Terah> until Abraham, Hellenism. From Abraham on, the true religion which is associated with this same Abraham—Judaism, (named) for his lineal descendant Judah. (3) God's Spirit-inspired, holy apostle Paul bears me out in this with some such words as, "In Christ Jesus there is neither barbarian, Scythian, Hellene nor Jew but a new creation."[3] (For at first, when creation had been made, it was new and had not been given any different name.) (4) And again, Paul says in agreement with this in another passage: "I am debtor both to the Hellenes and to the barbarians; both to the wise and to the unwise"[4] (meaning the Jews by "wise" but the Scythians by "unwise". And he says, "I am debtor," <meaning that "salvation is of the Jews.">)[5]

3,5 And so the entire nation of Israel were called Jews from the time of David. And all Israel continued to be called by their ancestral name of "Israelites," and to have the additional designation, "Jews," from the time of David, of his son Solomon, and of Solomon's son—I mean Rehoboam, who ruled in Jerusalem after Solomon.

---

[3] Col 3:11; Gal 6:15

[4] Rom 1:14

[5] John 4:22. Epiph gives these explanations to harmonize his two quotations, since Paul has mentioned only "Hellenes and Barbarians."

3,6 But to keep from getting side-tracked, bypassing the topic of the Jews' religion, and failing to touch on the subject of their beliefs, I shall give a few examples of them. For the facts about the Jews are, as we might say, perfectly plain to everyone. Hence I shall certainly not take the trouble to deal with this subject in great detail, but I must still give a few examples here.

4,1 Now Jews, who are Abraham's lineal descendants and the heirs of his true religion, have Abraham's circumcision, which he received by God's command at the age of ninety-nine, for the reason I have given earlier. It was so that his descendants would not repudiate the name of God on becoming strangers in a foreign land, but would bear a mark on their bodies instead to remind and convict them, and keep them true to their father's religion. (2) And Abraham's son, Isaac, was circumcised on the eighth day as God's commandment had directed. It is acknowledged that circumcision was by God's ordinance then, but then it had been ordained as a type. I shall prove this of it later, as we go on in order.

4,3 So Abraham's own children in succession—I mean beginning with himself, and Isaac and Jacob next, and Jacob's children after him—continued to be circumcised and adhere to the true religion in the land of Canaan (called Judaea and Philistia then, though its name is now Palestine) and in Egypt as well. (4) For Jacob, or Israel, went down to Egypt with his eleven children in the hundred and thirtieth year of his life. (Joseph, his other son, was already in Egypt reigning as king, though he had been sold by his brothers from envy. God's provision, which serves the righteous well, had turned their plot against this Joseph into a wonder.)

4,5 So Jacob went down to Egypt as I said, and his sons, wives and grandchildren, to the number of 75 persons—as the first book of Moses' Pentateuch, which clearly explains all this, tells us. (6) And they remained there for five generations—as I have said often enough, but must now repeat. For Jacob's posterity were the generations which are reckoned through Levi, the ancestor of the priests; and the ones which are reckoned through Judah, from whom in time came David, the first king. (7) And Levi was the father of Kohath and the others; Kohath was the father of Amram; Amram was the father of Moses, and of Aaron the high priest. Moses brought the children of Israel out of Egypt by the power of God, as the second book in the legislation says.

5,1 Still, it is obviously impossible to say distinctly what the regimen of the children of Israel was until this time, other than simply that they had the true religion and circumcision. (Though scripture does say, "The

children of Israel multiplied in the land of Egypt and became abundant."[6] It must surely have been due to laxity that the period of their sojourn and intercourse (with gentiles) produced this "abundance.") (2) But it had not yet been indicated with full clarity what they should eat, what they should forbid, or the other things they were commanded to observe by the Law's injunction. (3) However, when they were departing from Egypt, in the second year of their exodus they were vouchsafed God's legislation at the hands of Moses himself.

5,4 The legislation God gave them taught them like a pedagogue—indeed the Law was like a pedagogue in giving its precepts physically,[7] but with a spiritual hope. It taught them circumcision; Sabbath observance; the tithing of all their produce and of any human or animal offspring which was born among them; the presentation of firstfruits both on the fiftieth and on the thirtieth days; and to know God alone and serve him. (5) His Name, then, <was> proclaimed under its aspect of Monarchy, but the Trinity was always proclaimed in the Monarchy and was believed in by the foremost of them, that is the prophets and nazirites.[8] In the wilderness Israel offered sacrifices and various kinds of worship to the all-sovereign God in the service of the holy tabernacle, which Moses had constructed from patterns God had shown him.

5,6 These same Jews received prophetic oracles too, concerning the Christ to come. He was called "prophet," though he was God; and "angel," though he was the son of God, but would become man and be reckoned with his brethren. So say all the sacred scriptures, especially Deuteronomy the fifth book in the legislation, and <the ones> that follow it.

6,1 By the time of the captives' return from Babylon these Jews had gotten the following books and prophets, and the following books of the prophets: (2) 1. Genesis. 2. Exodus. 3. Leviticus. 4. Numbers. 5. Deuteronomy. 6. The Book of Joshua the son of Nun. 7. The Book of the Judges. 8. Ruth. 9. Job. 10. The Psalter. 11. The Proverbs of Solomon. 12. Ecclesiastes. 13. The Song of Songs. 14. The First Book of Kingdoms. 15. The Second Book of Kingdoms. 16. The Third Book of Kingdoms. 17. The Fourth Book of Kingdoms. 18. The First Book of Chronicles. 19. The Second Book of Chronicles. 20. The Book of the Twelve Prophets. 21. The Prophet Isaiah. 22. The Prophet Jeremiah, with the Lamentations

[6] Exod 1:7
[7] The pedagogue was authorized to beat his charges.
[8] ἡγιασμένοις

and the Epistles of Jeremiah and Baruch. 23. The Prophet Ezekiel. 24. The Prophet Daniel. 25. I Ezra. 26. II Ezra. 27. Esther. (3) These are the 27 books given the Jews by God. They are counted as 22, however, like the letters of their Hebrew alphabet, because ten books are doubled and reckoned as five. But I have explained this clearly elsewhere. (4) And they have two more books of disputed canonicity, the Wisdom of Sirach and the Wisdom of Solomon, apart from certain other apocrypha.

6,5 All these sacred books taught Judaism and Law's observances until the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. (6) And the Jews would have been all right under the Law's tutelage if they had accepted the Christ whom their pedagogue, I mean the Law, foretold and prophesied to them so as to learn, not of the Law's destruction but of its fulfillment, by accepting Christ's divinity and incarnation. For the types were in the Law, but the truth is in the Gospel.

6,7 The Law provides for physical circumcision. This served for a time until the great circumcision, baptism, which cuts us off from our sins and has sealed us in God's name. (8) The Law had a sabbath to keep us for the great Sabbath, the rest of Christ, so that in Christ we might enjoy a Sabbath-rest from sins. (9) And in the Law a lamb, a dumb animal, was sacrificed to guide us to the great, heavenly Lamb, slain for us and "for the whole world."[9] (10) And the Law ensured tithing, to keep us from overlooking the "iota," the ten, the initial letter of the name of Jesus.

7,1 Now since the Jews were guided by the type and did not reach the fulfillment which is proclaimed by the Law, by the prophets and others, and by every book (in scripture), they were put off the estate. And the gentiles came on, since Jews can no longer be saved unless they return to the grace of the Gospel. For every ordinance has been violated by them as each text says, in every scripture. (2) But briefly, with one text, I shall state the inevitability and unalterability of the declaration against them. Their sentence is plain to see as Scripture says, "Whatsoever soul will not hearken unto that prophet shall be cut off from his tribe, and from Israel, and from under the heavens."[10] (3) In other words the Lord is to give a final, saving confirmation of the truths he has imparted mystically through the Law, and a person who does not listen to him, and refuses to, cannot be saved even though he keeps the Law. For the Law cannot perfect the man, since the ordinances in it have been written physically and their real fulfillment is in Christ.

---

[9] John 2:2
[10] Deut 18:19; Exod 12:15; 19

7,4 So much for Judaism—I did mention a few points, so as not to omit all the facts about them, but to give them in part. For the subject of the Jews, and the refutation of them, is known beforehand, as we might say, to everyone. (5) I also explained their origin, how they had their beginning. At first <the> godly people were named <Abramians> after the patriarch Abraham's godly self because they were his descendants, but Israelites after his grandson, I mean Jacob or Israel. (6) But all the twelve tribes were called both Jews and Israelites from the time of David, the king from the tribe of Judah, and until David's son Solomon, and Rehoboam, who was Solomon's son but David's grandson.

7,7 And because of God's chastisement and Rehoboam's unworthiness, the twelve tribes were divided, and became two and a half with Judah—that is, with Rehoboam—and nine and a half with Jeroboam. (8) The nine and a half were called both Israelites and Israel, and were ruled by Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, in Samaria. But the two and a half at Jerusalem were called Jews, and were ruled by Solomon's son, Jeroboam. (9) And in turn there was a succession of kings. Rehoboam was the father of Abijah; Abijah, of Asa; Asa, of Jehoshaphat; Jehoshaphat, of Jehoram; Jehoram, of Ahaziah; Ahaziah, of Joash; Joash, of Amaziah, Amaziah, of Azariah or Uzziah; Azariah or Uzziah, of Jotham; Jotham, of Ahaz; Ahaz, of Hezekiah. At the time of Hezekiah and Ahaz, tribes from Israel were taken as captives to the mountains of Media. (10) After this, Hezekiah became the father of Manasseh. Manasseh was the father of Amon; Amon, of Josiah. Josiah was the father of Jeconiah, or Shallum, also called Amasiah. This Jeconiah was the father of the Jeconiah who is known as Zedekiah and Jehoiakim.

8,1 And no reader need have any doubt about him. Rather, he should admire the full discussion which has helpfully been set down here for good people who, for the sake of useful learning, would like to understand the precise sense of scripture. Simultaneously with the help they must feel relieved at once, at having regained the wording which, because of an ambiguity, certain ignorant persons have removed from the text with the intent of improving it.

8,2 For St. Matthew enumerated the generations (of Christ's genealogy) in three divisions,[11] and said that there were fourteen generations from Abraham tilll David, fourteen from David till the captivity, and fourteen from the captivity until Christ. The first two counts are plain to be seen with no lack of an item, for they include the times previous to Jeconiah. (3) But

[11] Matt 1:1-17

we see that the third count no longer has the total of fourteen generations found in a succession of names, but the total of thirteen.[12] This is because certain persons found a Jeconiah next to another Jeconiah, and thought that the item had been duplicated. (4) It was not a duplication however, but a distinct item. The son had been named "Jeconiah the son of Jeconiah" for his father. By removing the one name as though for scholarship's sake, certain persons ignorantly made the promise (which is implied in the text) come short of its purpose with regard to the total of the fourteen names, and destroyed the regularity of the arrangement.

8,5 So the Babylonian captivity began then, from the time of Jeconiah. During this time of the captivity, the elders approached Nebuchadnezzar in Babylon and begged that some of his own subjects be sent to Israel as settlers, to keep the country from becoming an uninhabited wasteland. (6) He accepted their appeal—he did not put them off—and sent four groups of his own people, called the Cuthaeans, Cudaeans, Seppharuraeans and Anagogavaeans. They then migrated to Samaria with their idols and settled it, choosing this land because of its richness and very great fertility.

8,7 But in time, because they kept being mauled by the wild beasts—lions, leopards, bears and the other predators—they sent to Babylon, asking with extreme astonishment what sort of life <the> former settlers had lived to be able to withstand the rapine and violence of the beasts. (8) The king sent for the elders and asked how they had conducted themselves <when> they held Judaea, and how they had escaped the rapine of the beasts, since there were so many onslaughts and maimings by animals in that country.

8,9 They told him of God's legislation and wisely pointed out to him the conclusion a reasonable judgment must draw, by saying that no nation could settle there unless it kept the Law of the God of heaven, given through Moses. For God is the protector of the land, and will not have the sins of idolatry and the rest committed in it by gentile nations.

8,10 The king paid attention, was convinced by his informants' entirely true explanation, and demanded a copy of the Law. They gave him one without demur, and with the Law also sent from Babylon Ezra, a priest, as a teacher of the Law, to teach the Law of Moses to the Assyrians who had settled in Samaria—the Cuthaeans and <the> others. (11) This happened in about the thirtieth year of the captivity of Israel and Jerusalem.

So Ezra and his successors taught the nation in Samaria; and those who had received the Law through Ezra, who came from Babylon, were called

[12] Cf. Matt 1:12-17.

Samaritans. Another forty years went by and the captivity was revoked, and Israel returned from Babylon.

9,1 It is an amazing coincidence that, to correspond with the four nations, four sects have also arisen in that very nation—I mean first, the sect of Essenes; second, of Gorothenes; third, of Sebuaeans; and fourth, of Dositheans. Here I can begin my treatment of the subject of sectarianism,[13] and shall briefly explain how it <arose>. (2) How else but <in the same way in which> tribes arose from the proliferation of the different languages, various nations emerged to correspond with each tribe and clan, every nation chose its own king to head it, and the result was the outbreak of wars, and conflicts between clashing nations. For each used force to get its own way and, from the insatiable greed which is common to us all, to appropriate its neighbors' property. (3) So too at this time we have been discussing. Since there had been a change in Israel's one religion, and the scripture of the Law <had been transferred> to other nations—I mean to Assyrians, the ancestors of the colonist Samaritans—the division of Israel's opinion also resulted. (4) And then error arose, and discord began to sow seed from the one true religion in many counterfeit beliefs, as each individual thought best, and thought that he was proficient in the letter (of scripture) and could expound it to suit himself.

9.

Against Samaritans,[1] *Sect seven from Hellenism, but nine of the series*

1,1 The Samaritans are the first of the sects which were founded on sacred scripture after those Greek heresies—which were <invented> by men by crack-brained thinking, with their own reason without sacred scripture. (2) The whole nation, then, were called the nation of Samaritans.

1,2 "Samaritans" means "watchmen"—because of their being stationed in the land as watchmen, or because of their being observers of the commandment in accordance with the Law of Moses. (3) Also, the mountain where they settled was named Somoron—and Somer too for one of the ancients, Somoron the son of Somer was his name. (4) Somoron was a son of one of the Perizzites and Girgashites who inhabited the land at that time.

---

[13] Epiph is about to conclude his Proem. Cf. his wording of 2,13 with that of 9,4.

[1] Fil. 7 gives a description of the Samaritans which is not unlike that of Epiph, but is plainly from a different source.

They were descendants of Canaan,[2] who had seized this land, the one that is now called Judaea or Samaria. It belonged to the sons of Shem and was not their own,[3] since Canaan himself was the son of Ham, Shem's uncle (sic). (5) And thus they are called Samaritans for various reasons—Somer, Somoron, their guardianship of the land, and their observance of the precepts of the Law.

2,1 The first difference between them and Jews is that they were given no text of the prophets after Moses but only the Pentateuch,[4] which was given to Israel's descendants through Moses, at the close of their departure from Egypt. (By "Pentateuch" I mean Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy; in Hebrew their names are B'reshith, Elleh sh'moth, Vayyiqra, Vayidabber and Elleh ha d'varim.) (2) There are intimations of the resurrection of the dead in these five books, but it is certainly not proclaimed plainly. There also hints in them of God's only-begotten Son, of the Holy Spirit, and of opposition to idolatry, but as the most obvious doctrine in them the subject of <the> Monarchy is introduced, and in the Monarchy the Trinity is proclaimed spiritually.

2,3 Those who had received the Law were eager to abandon idolatry and learn to know the one God, but had no interest in more precise information. Since they had gone wrong and not clearly understood the whole of the faith and the precise nature of our salvation, they knew nothing about the resurrection of the dead and do not believe in it.[5] And they do not recognize the Holy Spirit, for they did not know about him.

2,4 And yet this sect, which denies the resurrection of the dead but rejects idolatry, (is) idolatrous in itself with knowing it, because the idols of the four nations are hidden in the mountain they libelously call Gerizim. (5) Whoever cares to make an accurate investigation of Mount Gerizim, should be told that the two mountains, Gerizim and Ebal, are near Jericho—across the Jordan east of Jericho, as Deuteronomy and the Book of Joshua the son of Nun tell us.[6] (6) They are unwitting idolaters then, because, from wherever they are, they face the mountain for prayer, it sacred, if you please! For scripture cannot be telling a lie when it says, "They continued even to this day keeping the Law and worshiping their idols,"[7] as we learn in the Fourth Book of Kingdoms.

---

[2] Fil. 7.1 makes Samoreus the son of Canaan.
[3] Jub. 10.27-34
[4] Cf. Fil. 7.1.
[5] Cf. Fil. 7.2.
[6] Cf. Deut 11:29-30.
[7] Cf. 4 Kms 17:32-34.

3,1 But they are refuted in every way with regard to the resurrection of the dead. First from Abel, since his blood conversed with the Lord after he died. But blood is not soul; the soul is in the blood. And God did not say, "The soul crieth unto me," but, "The blood crieth unto me,"[8] proving that there is hope for a resurrection of bodies.

3,2 Moreover Enoch was translated so as not to see death, and was nowhere to be found. Sarah too, made fruitful again at the implantation of seed, after her womb was dead and her menstrual flow dried up; conceiving a child by promise in her old age, because of the hope of the resurrection.

3,3 And this is not all. When Jacob too was <seeing to> his own bones, he was giving orders about them as of things that were not going to perish. And not only he but Joseph too, when he gave his orders in his turn, gave indication of the form of the resurrection.[9] (4) And this is not all. Moreover Aaron's rod, which budded when it was dry, bore fruit again in hope of life, showing that our dead bodies will arise, and pointing to resurrection. And Moses' wooden rod similarly gave token of resurrection, since it was brought to life by God's will and became a serpent.

3,5 Moreover, in blessing Reuben Moses says, "Let Reuben live, and let him not die,"[10] though he <means> someone who has died long ago. This is to show that there is life after death, but a sentence of second death, for damnation. So he gives him two blessings by saying, "Let him live," at the resurrection, and "Let him not die," at the judgment—not meaning death by departing the body, but death by damnation.

3,6 These few points will suffice against the Samaritans. But they have some other customs too, perfectly stupid ones. They wash with urine when they return from a foreign land, <as though> they had been contaminated, if you please! Whenever they touch someone else, who is a gentile, they immerse themselves in water with their clothes on.[11] For they think it is pollution to take hold of one person, or touch another,[12] if he is of another persuasion. But they have a bad case of insanity.

4,1 But pay attention, friend, and you will know what an easy thing their foolishness is to refute. They abhor a dead body on sight since they

---

[8] Gen 4:10

[9] I.e., resurrection is bodily.

[10] Deut 33:6

[11] Cf. Hipp. Refut. 9.15.3-6.

[12] A similar attitude toward outsiders sometimes appears in the Qumran documents; see 1Q S 5,14-20 (Wise et al. p. 132); CD 12,6-11 (op. cit. p. 70); 13,12-15 (op. cit. p. 71).

are dead in their works themselves. For not one but many testimonies witness that a corpse is not unclean, but that the Law was speaking symbolically. (2) For no "two or three witnesses," but 620,000 bear me out in this, the ones which were counted in the wilderness, <and buried the people that lusted in the wilderness>. And as many others and more, and many more still—the ones which followed Joseph's burial urn. It was carried with them for forty years during the entire period of the sojourn, and it was not abhorred and did not pollute.

4,3 The Law was telling the truth in saying, "He that toucheth the corpse remaineth unclean until even, and shall wash himself with water and be purified."[13] But it was saying this symbolically of the death of our Lord Jesus Christ from his suffering in the flesh. (4) This can be demonstrated from the word, "the," the so-called definite article. Wherever the article appears, it is confirmatory of someone who has been specified and is easily recognizable because of the article. But without the article we must understand the word indeterminately, of anyone. (5) If we say "king," for example, we mean the name but have not shown clearly which king is specified; we speak both of a "king" of Persians, and a "king" of Medes and Elamites. But if we say "the king" with the addition of the article, what we mean is beyond doubt. The king in question, someone called king, someone known to be king, or the ruler of this or that kingdom is implied by the article.

4,6 And if we say "god" without the article, we have spoken either of any heathen god, or of the actual God. But if we say "the God," it is clear that because of the article we mean the actual God, who is the true God and is known to be. And so with "man" and "the man."

4,7 And if the Law were saying, "If ye touch *a* corpse," the sentence[14] would be pronounced against everyone, and the word in question would simply apply <to> every dead body. But since it says, "If one touch *the* corpse," it is referring to one particular corpse—I mean to the Lord, as I have already explained. (8) The Law was saying this symbolically, of those who would lay hands on Christ and consign him to a cross, since they had need of purification till their sun should set, and another light dawn on them through the baptism of water, the "laver of regeneration."[15] (9) Peter bears me out here in speaking to the Israelites at Jerusalem who asked

[13] Cf. Lev 11:24-25.
[14] I.e., the sentence, "You must go into temporary exile."
[15] Titus 3:5

him, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?"[16] because he had said "this Jesus whom ye have crucified," to them. And when they were pricked to the heart he said, "Repent, men and brethren, and let every one of you be baptized in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and your sins will be forgiven, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."[17]

4,10 So the law is not speaking of a corpse—or, even though the Law speaks of a corpse, it is speaking of a particular one. <For of an unspecified corpse> it gives a different decree, since it says, "If a corpse pass by, shut your doors and windows, lest the house be defiled"—as though it were saying, with reference to the hearing of a sin, "If you hear a sound of sin, or (see) a sight of transgression, shut your eye to lust, your mouth to evil-speaking, and your ear to wicked rumor, lest the whole house"—that is, the soul and the body—"be killed." (11) This is why the prophet too says, "Death is come up through the windows,"[18] and surely does not mean our actual windows—otherwise we could shut our windows and never die. But the bodily senses—sight, hearing and so on—are our windows through which death enters us if we sin with them.

4,12 Joseph buried Israel, then, and was not rendered unclean, even though he had fallen on his face and kissed him after his death. And scripture does not say that he washed for purification. (13) The tradition I have been taught says that the angels buried the body of the sainted Moses,[19] and they did not wash; and neither were the angels profaned by the saint's body. (5,1) And again, I am afraid of dragging out the solution of our problem.[20] Bby one argument, or a second, a wise man will be given skill in the Lord against the opposition.

5,2 And even though I shall need to speak briefly of the Spirit I do not mind. For example, the Lord expressly says to Moses, "Bring up unto me seventy elders into the mount, and I shall take of the Spirit that is upon thee, and will pour it out upon them, and they shall lend thee aid."[21]

5,3 And to inform us about the Son, <the> Father says, "Let us make man in our image and after our likeness."[22] "Let us make," does not mean one person (alone), and neither does, "The Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah fire and brimstone *from the Lord* out of heaven."[23]

---

[16] Acts 2:37
[17] Acts 2:36
[18] Jerem 9:20
[19] Cf. Evodius/Aug. Ep. 158.6.
[20] The problem posed at 4,1
[21] Num 11:16-17
[22] Gen 1:26
[23] Gen 19:24

5,4 And <there is no point in arguing with Samaritans> about prophets. Since they were given <only> the Pentateuch at first and no further scriptures, they conformed only to the Pentateuch alone and not the rest. Hence today, even if someone speaks of the others to them—I mean David, Isaiah and the prophets after them—Samaritans do not receive them. They are prevented from that by the tradition they have, which has been brought on to them from their own ancestors.

5,5 And let this conclude my sketch of the Samaritans. I have deliberately given it in brief, for fear of stringing out the content of my treatise.

10.

Against Essenes, Sect one after Samaritans,[24] *but ten of the series*

1,1 The Samaritans were divided into four sects. These agreed <on> circumcision, the Sabbath and the <other provisions> of the Law. But each of the three differed from its fellows—with the sole exception of the Dositheans, in unimportant ways and to a limited extent.

1,2 The Essenes continued their original practice and never went beyond it. After them, the Gorothenes disagreed over a certain small point for a dispute has arisen between them, I mean between the Sebuaeans, Essenes and Gorothenes. (3) The nature of the dispute is this. The Law directed the Jews to gather at Jerusalem from all quarters—often, <and> at three times of the year, the Feast of Unleavened Bread, Pentecost and Tabernacles. (4) There were Jews living here and there within the boundaries of both Judaea and Samaria, and they naturally used to cross Samaria on their way to Jerusalem. (5) Since (Jews and Samaritans) would meet at one season, (each) with their gathering for the festival, clashes would result. Besides, when Ezra was building Jerusalem after the return from Babylon, and the Samaritans asked if they could contribute aid to the Jews and take part in the building, and were refused by Ezra himself, and by Nehemiah

[24] The tradition which surprisingly locates the Essenes in Samaria might find some justification in Josephus' remark that they were widely dispersed, see Jos. Bel. 2.8.4. See also Wise's Introduction in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. At Eus. H. E. 4.22.7 Essenes are called a Jewish sect. Fil. 9, which makes the Essenes Jewish rather than Samaritan, gives a description of them which is not dissimilar to that of Josephus.

11.
Against Sebuaeans, Sect two from Samaritans, but eleven of the series

1,1 then in rage and anger the Sebuaeans changed the dates of these festivals, first because of their anger at Ezra, but secondly for the reason I have mentioned, the one which provoked them to battle because of the people crossing their land. (2) They put the new moon of the Feast of Unleavened Bread after the new year, which falls in the autumn—that is, after the month of Tishri, which is called August by the Romans but Mesori by the Egyptians, Gorpiaeus by the Macedonians, and Apellaeus by the Greeks. (3) They begin the new year at that point and celebrate the Days of Unleavened Bread immediately, but they celebrate Pentecost in the fall, and observe their Feast of Tabernacles at the time when the Days of Unleavened Bread and Passover are being kept among the Jews.

12.
Against Gorothenes,[25] *Sect three from Samaritans but twelve of the series*

1,1 But the Gorothenes and the others were not convinced by the Sebuaeans. When Essenes are in the neighborhood of the others they do the same as they;[26] only the Gorothenes and Dositheans have the quarrel with the Sebuaeans. (2) And they, I mean the Gorothenes and Dositheans, keep the Festivals of Unleavened Bread, Passover, Pentecost and Tabernacles, and their one set fast day, when the Jews observe them. The others though (i.e., the Sebuaeans) do not keep them then, but in in their own way in the months I have mentioned.

13.
Against Dositheans,[27] *Sect four from Samaritans, but thirteen of the series*

1,1 Now Dositheans differ from these (others) in many ways. They acknowledge the resurrection and have ascetic disciplines. They abstain

---

[25] Gorothenes are mentioned at Eus. H. E. 4.22.5 where they are said to have been founded by a Gorothaeus.

[26] This seems most unlikely, especially given the strictness as to the dates of festivals in the Qumran community. See, e.g., 1Q S 1,14-15 (Wise et al. p. 140) and Qumran's calendrical texts in general (op. cit. p. 317f.).

[27] Dositheans are mentioned or discussed at Eus. H. E. 4.22.5; PsT 1.1; Fil. 4; Orig. In

from meat; moreover some abstain from matrimony <after having lived in that state>, while others are even virgins. (2) They likewise have the customs of circumcision, the Sabbath, and not touching one person or another out of loathing for all humanity. It is said that they keep fasts and have a rigorous discipline.

1,3 Dositheus' reason for holding these views was the following. Coming from the Jews, he joined forces with the Samaritan peoples.[28] He was foremost in their legal education and mishnahs,[29] and was ambitious for the highest rank, and because he failed to achieve it and was not considered of any account among the Jews, he defected to the Samaritans and founded this sect.

1,4 From an excess of would-be wisdom he retired to a cave somewhere. It is said that he persisted in futile, hypocritical fasting, and so died from lack of bread and water—willingly, if you please! After a while people came to visit him, and found his body reeking with decay and breeding worms, and a cloud of flies swarming on it.[30] By ending his own life in this futile way he became the cause of their sect, and his imitators are named Dositheans, or Dosithenes, after him.

2,1 And as far as I have learned, these are the differences between these four sects; they will be refuted by what I have said about them. (2) But I shall return to the successive infiltrations (into our ranks), both linking the victims of imposture with each other, and giving the case against them by exposing their vile practices and briefly refuting the poisonous bite of these vicious, deadly serpents.

This concludes the four Samaritan sects. Judaism remains to be dealt with. Judaism was divided into seven sects.[31]

Joh 13.27; Princ. 4.3.2, and Comm Ser. In Matt 33 (Klostermann p. 59) where Dositheus' Sabbath regulations are ridiculed. See also Clem. Rec. 1.54.2-5; Hom 2.24; Const. Ap. 6.8.1; Jer. Vit. Paul. 13.

[28] Eus. and the Pseudo-Clementines make Dositheus Jewish, while PsT and Fil. say he is Samaritan. Epiph might be attempting to reconcile the two traditions.

[29] δευτερώσεις

[30] Or. In Joh. 13.27 notes that the Samaritans believed that Dositheus had not died. The above appears intended to refute this.

[31] Eus. H. E. 4.22.5, quoting Hegesippus, also counts seven: Essenes, Galileans, Hemerobaptists, Masbotheans, Samaritans, Sadducees, Pharisees.

The Seven Sects of Judaism

1,1 Again, after these Samaritan sects and <the> Greek ones I spoke of earlier, a total of seven arose in Judaea and Jerusalem among the Jews,[1] before Christ's incarnation.

14.
Against Sadducees, Sect one from Judaism, but fourteen of the series

2,1 First are the Sadducees, who were an offshoot of Dositheus.[2] These give themselves the name of "Sadducees," and the title is derived from "righteousness," if you please; "zedek" means "righteousness." (But anciently there was also a priest named Zadok.)[3]

2,2 However, these did not abide by their master's teaching. They rejected the resurrection of the dead[4] and held an opinion like the Samaritans'. But they do not admit the existence of angels, though Samaritans do not deny this. And they do not know the Holy Spirit,[5] for they have not been deemed worthy of him. All their observances are just like the Samaritans'. (3) But they were Jews, not Samaritans; for they offered sacrifice in Jerusalem, and cooperated with Jews in everything else.

3,1 But they too will be demolished by the Lord's trustworthy saying, which they brought on themselves through his solution to their problem, when they came to him and said, "Can there be a resurrection of the dead?"

And "There were seven brothers,"[6] they said, "and the first married a wife and died childless. And the second took her—Moses commands a man to perform the levirate for his brother's wife if he has died childless, and marry her for his brother's sake, to beget offspring in the name of the deceased. So the first took her, and the second," they said, "and died, and so with all seven. But at the resurrection of the dead whose wife will she be, since all seven knew her?"

---

[1] For other lists of Jewish sects see Justin Dial. 80.4; Eus. H. E. 4.22.7; in NHC, Tri. Trac.112,18-22 accuses the Jews of spawning sects.

[2] Sadducees are traced to Dositheus at Clem. Recog. 1.54.4; PsT 1.1. Hipp. Refut. 9.29 links them with Samaria. Christian sources refer to them as a "sect" at Eus. H. E. 4.22.7; Justin Dial. 80.4; Const. Ap. 6.6.2.

[3] Cf. Ezek 40:46; 43:19; 44:15; 48:11; Matt 1:14. Priests at Qumran are regularly "sons of Zadok."

[4] Cf. Matt 22:23 and see PsT 1.1.

[5] Cf. Acts 23:8.

[6] Cf. Mark 12:18-27 parr.

3,2 But the Lord replied, "Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures nor the power of God. In the resurrection of the dead they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are equal unto the angels. But that the dead will be raised Moses will teach you, as God declared to him and said, 'I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.' But he is a God of the living, not of the dead."[7] And he "put them to silence." For they are easily cured and cannot hold out even for an instant against the truth.

15.

Against Scribes, <Sect> two from Judaism, but fifteen of the series

1,1 After these Sadducees came the Scribes—part way through their time or even exactly contemporary with them. Scribes were persons who repeated the Law as though they were teaching it as a sort of grammar. They observed the other Jewish customs but introduced a kind of extra, quibbling teaching, if you please. (2) They did not live just by the Law but in addition observed the "washing of pots, cups, platters"[8] and the other vessels of table service as though they were bent on the pure and holy, if you please—"washing their hands thoroughly," and also thoroughly cleansing themselves, in natural water and baths, of certain types of pollution. (3) And they had certain "fringes" as signs of their way of life, to vaunt their boast of it and win the praise of the onlookers. And it was their custom to put "phylacteries"—that is, broad borders of purple cloth—on their clothes.

1,4 One would think—since this too is in the Gospel—that it might be speaking of amulets, since some people used to call their amulets "phylacteries." (5) But the expression has nothing whatever to do with this. Scribes used to wear dresses or shawls, and robes or tunics[9] made of broad strips of cloth and made "purple woven"[10] with purple fabric, and precise speakers used to change the names of the purple strips to "phylacteries." Thus the Lord has called them "phylacteries" as they did. (6) But the sequel too, "and the craspeda of their outer garments," explains the meaning of the

---

[7] Matt 22:34
[8] Mark 7:4
[9] Cf. Ep. Aristeas 158; Justin Dial. 46.
[10] This is a folk etymology. Epiph derives φυλακτήριον from ἁλουργοϋφεῖς, "purple woven," by a rearrangement of its letters. For κοκκινὸν ῥᾶμμα and φυλακτήρια see Justin Dial. 46.4-5.

term; <it says> "the craspeda" to mean fringes, and "the phylacteries" to mean the purple strips. <For it says,> "Ye make broad the phylacteries and enlarge the craspeda, of your outer garments."[11]

1,7 Each Scribe had certain tassels at the four corners of his cloak, tied right to the thread, during the time when he was keeping continence or practicing celibacy. For each Scribe would set and designate a time of chastity or continence, and they had these tassels principally to give public notice of their undertaking, so that no one would lay a hand on the supposedly sanctified.

2,1 Scribes had four "repetitions."[12] One <was in circulation> in the name of the prophet Moses,[13] a second in that of their teacher called Aqiba or Bar Aqiba, another in the name Addan or Annan, also called Judas, and another in the name of the sons of Hasmonaeus. (2) Whatever customs they derive from these four traditions under the impression that they are wisdom—they are unwisdom mostly—are boasted of and praised, and celebrated and acclaimed as the teaching to be given first place.

16.
Against Pharisees,[14] *<Sect> three from Judaism, but sixteen of the series*

1,1 Another sect, that of the Pharisees, follows next after these two. They had the same ideas as they, I mean as the Scribes—whose name means "teachers of the Law," for the Lawyers were associated with them as well. (2) But again, the Pharisees also thought differently, since they had more regulations. For some of them, when they were practicing asceticism and had marked off a ten- or eight-year period or, similarly, a four-year period of chastity or continence, would quite often, along with constant prayer, enter upon the following ordeal—to avoid an accident or wet dream, if you please! (3) In order to live as much as possible without sleep, they would make their beds on benches only a span wide and stretch out on these at evening so that, if one went to sleep and fell on the floor, he could get up

---

[11] Mark 23:5

[12] δευτερώσεις. This would render "mishnahs," but whether Epiph understood the term in that form is uncertain.

[13] In the Mishnah, some anonymous regulations are designated *halakhah d'Mosheh mi-Sinai.*

[14] Pharisees are termed a "sectarians" at PsT 1.1; Hipp. Refut. 9.28; Eus. H. E. 4.22.7; Clem. Rec. 1.54.6; Justin Dial. 80.4; Const. Ap. 6.6.3.

again for prayer. (4) Others would gather pebbles and scatter them under their bedclothes, so that they would be pricked and not fall fast asleep, but be forced to keep themselves awake. Others would even use thorns as a mattress, for the same reason.

1,5 They fasted twice a week, on the second and fifth days.[15] They paid the tithe, gave the firstfruits—those of the thirtieth and those of the fiftieth days—and rendered the sacrifices and prayers without fail. (6) They went out in the Scribes' style of dress which we have been speaking of, with the shawl, the other fashions, and women's cloaks, and they walked in wide boots, and with wide tongues on their sandals. (7) But they were called "Pharisees" because they were separated from the others by the extra voluntary ceremonies they believed in;[16] "pharesh" is Hebrew for "separation."

2,1 They acknowledged the resurrection of the dead and believed in angels and a Spirit,[17] but like the others they knew nothing of the Son of God. (2) Moreover fate[18] and astrology meant a great deal to them. To begin with, they have other names in Hebrew for the Greek names that are taken from the astrology of the misguided. (3) For example, Helius is Chammah and Shemesh. Selene is Jareach, or Ha-lʾbanah, and hence is also called Mene—the "month" is called "the mene" and the moon is called "mene," as it also is in Greek because of the month.

Ares is Kokhabh Okbol; Hermes is Kokhabh Chochmah; Zeus, Kokhabh Baʿal; Aphrodite, Zerva or Lilith; Cronus is Kokhabh Shabbʾtai. (They have other terms for him too, but I cannot give the names of these things exactly.)

2,4 Moreover, here again are their Hebrew names for what the misguided futilely regard as planets, though <the Greeks, who> wrongfully misled the world into impiety, call them the signs of the zodiac: Telaʾ, Sor, Tʾomin, Zarʾtan, Ari, Bethulah, Moznaim, ʿAkrabh, Qesheth, Gʾdi, Dalli, Daggim. (5) Following the Greeks to no purpose, they, I mean the Pharisees, translated the same terms into Hebrew as follows. Aries is what

---

[15] Cf. Luke 18:12; Matt 23:23. For the "second" and "fifth days" see Did.8.1; Const. Ap. 7.23.1.

[16] Cf. PsT 1.1; Clem Hom. 11.28.4; Orig. In Matt 23:23.

[17] Cf. Acts 23:8.

[18] According to Josephus, Pharisees believe that "some things, but not all, are the work of fate," Ant. 13.5.9. For Christian references to a Pharisaic belief in fate see Hipp. Refut. 9.28.5; Const. Ap.6.6.3.

they call Tela'; Taurus is Sor; Gemini, T'omim; Cancer, Zar'tan; Leo, Ari; Virgo, Bethulah; Libra, Moznaim; Scorpio, Akrabh; Sagittarius, Qesheth; Capricorn, G'di; Aquarius, Dalli; Pisces, Daggim.[19]

3,1 I have not put these things down in order to confuse the reader, or to endorse the vulgar chatter of those who introduced the confused, crazy nonsense of astrology to the world. The truth convicts this of incoherence and error. (2) In other treatises I have said a great deal in refutation of those who believe in fortune and fate; furthermore, I have written briefly against them in the preface to this work. But lest it be thought that I make vexatious attacks on people rather than finding out the exact truth from (their own) traditions and publishing it, I have mentioned these things even by name.

3,3 But (all this) is their ultimate embarrassment, and for people who acknowledge the resurrection and believe in a just judgment it is uncommon silliness. (4) How can there be (both) judgment and fate? It must be one or the other of the two. Either there is such a thing as fate, and then there is no judgment, since the (human) agent does not act of himself but of necessity, under fate's control. (5) Or else there is a judgment which really looms ahead, there are laws which serve as judges, and evildoers who stand trial—with law acknowledged to be just, and God's judgment absolutely trustworthy. Then fate means nothing, and there is no proof whatever of its existence.

4,1 The determination that, according to the difference between them, one person must be punished for his sins while another is commended for his good behavior, is made because of their ability to sin or not sin. (2) This <can be proved> concisely with one saying, <the> truth uttered by the prophet Isaiah in the person of the Lord, "If ye be willing and hearken to me, ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye are not willing and do not hearken to me, a sword shall devour you. (3) For the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."[20] Thus it is plain and clear to everyone, and not open to doubt, that the God <who> said in his own person, "If ye be willing and if ye are not willing," has granted free agency, so that whether he does right or pursues an evil course is up to the man.

4,4 Thus the notion of those who believe in fate is mistaken, most of all the Pharisees. What the Savior told them, not with just one saying but frequently, must be said of them even many times more often: "Woe unto

[19] For examples of the zodiac as a synagogue floor decoration with the signs named in Hebrew, see Goodenough vols. 1; 9.

[20] Isa 1:19-20

you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For ye have abandoned the weightier matters of the Law, judgment and mercy, and pay tithes of dill and mint and rue. And ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the trencher, but their interior is full of uncleanness and excess."[21]

"And ye hold as binding an oath by that which lieth upon the altar, but deem void the oath by the altar itself. And ye say that to swear by heaven is nothing, but if one swear by that which is above heaven, this is demanded of him. Doth not the altar bear that which lieth upon it, and is not heaven the throne of him that sitteth upon it?[22]

"Ye say, if a man shall say to his father and mother, It is Corban, that is to say, a gift, by which thou mightest be profited by me, he shall no longer honor his father, and ye have made the commandment of God of none effect through the tradition of your elders.[23] (7) And ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves."[24]

4,8 What more than the sacred sayings could one cite in opposition to them? Indeed, I prefer to rest content with the Savior's wise, true statements, which the Pharisees could not face even for an instant.

17.

Against Hemerobaptists,[25] *Sect four from Judaism, but seventeen of the series*

1,1 A sect of Hemerobaptists, as they are called, accompanies these. It is no different from the others, but has the same ideas as the Scribes and Pharisees. However, it certainly does not resemble the Sadducees in the denial of resurrection of the dead, although it does in the unbelief which is found in the others.

But this sect had acquired this additional characteristic, of being baptized every day in spring, fall, winter and summer, so that they got the name of Hemerobaptists. (3) For this sect alleged that there is no life for a man unless he is baptized daily with water, and washed and purified from every fault.

---

[21] Cf. Matt 23:25.
[22] Cf. Matt 23:181-22.
[23] Mark 7:11; 9
[24] Matt 23:15
[25] Hemerobaptists are mentioned at Eus. H. E. 4.22.7; Const. Ap. 6.6.5; Justin Dial. 80.4. Clem. Hom. 11.23.1 uses the term of John the Baptist. Josephus attributes the custom of daily bathing to the Essenes (Jos. Bel. 2.8.1). The term translates the Hebrew טובלי יום, which in itself means persons who have incurred uncleanness on a particular day and bathed to remove it, and must "remain unclean until evening."

2,1 But this sect too I can refute with one argument, since the words[26] are expressions of unbelief on their part rather than of faith. If they are baptized every day their conscience is convincing them that the hope they had yesterday is dead, the faith and the purification. (2) For if they were satisfied with one baptism they would have confidence in this as in something living and forever immortal. But they must think it has been nullified since they bathed today, not to cleanse the body or get rid of dirt, but because of sins. Again, by taking another bath the next day, they have made it plain that the previous baptism of yesterday is dead. For unless yesterday's had died they would not need another the next day for the purification of sins.

2,3 And if they do not simply avoid sin, supposing that the water will cleanse them as they keep sinning every day, their supposition is of no use and their deed is undone and come too late. (4) Neither Ocean nor all the rivers and seas, the perennial streams and brooks and all the water in the world, can wash away sin, for this is not reasonable and is not by God's ordinance. Repentance cleanses, and the one baptism, through the pronouncing of the Name in the mysteries.

2,5 But I shall pass this sect by as well. I believe that I have given sufficient indication of the concise remedy for their lunacy, as it has been set down here for the benefit of the readers.

18.

Against Nasaraeans,[27] *Sect five from Judaism but eighteen of the series*

1,1 Next I shall undertake the describe the sect after the Hemerobaptists, called the sect of the Nasaraeans. They are Jews by nationality, from Gileaditis, Bashanitis and the Transjordan as I have been told, but descendants of Israel himself. This sect practices Judaism in all respects and have scarcely any beliefs beyond the ones that I have mentioned. (2) It too had been given circumcision, and it kept the same Sabbath and observed the same festivals, and certainly did not inculcate fate or astrology.

---

[26] I.e., the words ἡμέρα and βαπτίζειν.

[27] This group has some traits in common with the Mandaeans, whose usual name for themselves is "Nazoraeans", and who reject the Pentateuch. Lidzbarski explains the term, Nazoraean, as "Vertreter eines Berufes, besonders eines bestimmtes Lehrtätigkeit", *Ginza* pp. ix-x. However, the two groups are certainly not the same. Fil. 8 spells the name of the group "Nazoraeans"; his very uncomplimentary description of it has nothing in common with that of Epiph.

1,3 It also recognized as fathers the persons in the Pentateuch from Adam to Moses who were illustrious for the excellence of their piety—I mean Adam, Seth, Enoch, Methuselah, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Levi and Aaron, Moses and Joshua the son of Nun. However, it would not accept the Pentateuch itself. It acknowledged Moses and believed that he had received legislation—not this legislation though, they said, but some other.[28] (4) And so, though they were Jews who kept all the Jewish observances, they would not offer sacrifice or eat meat;[29] in their eyes it was unlawful to eat meat or make sacrifices with it. They claimed that these books are forgeries[30] and that none of these customs were instituted by the fathers. (5) This was the difference between the Nasaraeans and the others; and their refutation is to be seen not in one place but in many.

2,1 First, <in> their acknowledgment of the fathers and patriarchs, and Moses. Since no other writing speaks of them, how do they know the fathers' names and excellence if not from the Pentateuchal writings themselves? (2) And how is it possible that there is truth and falsehood in the same place, and that scripture partly tells the truth but partly lies, (3) when the Savior says, "Either make the tree good and his fruits good; or else make the tree corrupt and his fruits corrupt. For a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit?"[31]

2,4 Hence their idea and the teaching they inculcate is futile, and there are many grounds for its refutation. Thus not only are the events recorded in scripture famous to this day, but even the sites of the wonders are preserved. (5) First there is the spot where Abraham offered the ram to God, called Mount Zion to this day. Moreover, the site of the oak of Mamre, where the calf was served to the angels. But if Abraham served a meat-dish to angels, he would not fail to share some of it himself.

3,1 Moreover, the tradition of the lamb <which> was slaughtered in Egypt is still famous among the Egyptians, even the idolaters. (2) At the time when the Passover was instituted there—this is the beginning of spring, at the first equinox—all the Egyptians take red lead, though without knowing why, and smear their lambs with it. And they also smear the trees, the

---

[28] Jews are said to falsify the Law and the works of Abraham at the Mandaean *Ginza* 43,21-23.

[29] Animal sacrifices are, in effect, termed obsolete in the NHC tractate Gos. Phil. 54,34-55,1; they are also deprecated at Gos. Phil. 62,35-63,4 and Melch. 6,28-7,1.

[30] Lidzbarski translates the term with which Mandaeans reject the Torah as a Buch des Frevels, *Johannesbuch* 192,15-193,2.

[31] Matt 12:33 and 7:18

fig-trees and the rest, and spread the report that fire once burned up the world on this day. But the fiery-red appearance of the blood is a protection against a calamity of such a magnitude and such nature.

3,3 But where can I not find evidence of the rite?[32] Thus even today the remains of Noah's ark are still shown in Cardyaei.[33] (4) And if one were to make a search and discover them—it stands to reason—he would surely also find the ruins of the altar at the foot of the mountain. That was where Noah stayed after leaving the ark; and when he had offered some of the clean beasts, and their fat, to the Lord God, he was told, "Behold, I have given thee all things even as herbs of the field. Slay and eat!"[34]

3,5 But once more, I shall also pass by the sect's strangeness and foolishness. I am content with the few words I have said, inserted here with my limited ability to oppose the error of the sect we have been discussing.

19.

Against Ossaeans,[35] *Sect six from Judaism, but nineteen of the series*

1,1 After this sect in turn, comes another one which is closely connected with them, the one called the sect of the Ossaeans. These are Jews like the others, hypocritical in their behavior and horrid in their way of thinking. (2) I have been told that they originally came from Nabataea, Ituraea, Moabitis and Arielis, the lands beyond the basin of what sacred scripture calls the "Salt Sea." This is the one which is called the "Dead Sea." (3) And from the translation of the name, this "People of the Ossaeans" means "sturdy people."

1,4 The man called Elxai[36] joined them later, in the reign of the emperor Trajan[37] after the Savior's incarnation, and he was a false prophet. He wrote a book,[38] supposedly by prophecy or as though by inspired wisdom. They also say that there was another person, Iexaeus, Elxai's brother.

1,5 Elxai was deluded by nature and a deliberate fraud. Originally he was a Jew with Jewish beliefs, but he did not live by the Law. He introduced

---

[32] Or: of the series (of instances of meat-eating)
[33] Hipp. Refut. 10.30.7; Theoph. Ad Autol. 3.19.16-17 (Grant p. 124)
[34] Gen 9:3 and Acts 10:13
[35] This Sect is comparable with Hippolytus' Elchasaites, Hipp. Refut. 9.13.1-17.3, but Epiphanius' sources are not the same as Hippolytus'and are more ample.
[36] Cf. Hipp. Refut. 9.13.1.
[37] For this date see Hipp. Refut. 9.13.4.
[38] Hipp. Refut. 9.13.1. At Eus. H. E. 6.38 the book is said to have fallen from heaven.

one thing after another and formed his own sect, (6) and designated salt, water, earth, bread, heaven, aether, and wind as objects for them to swear by as worship. But again, at some time he designated seven other witnesses—I mean the sky, water, "holy spirits" <as> he says, the angels of prayer, the olive, salt, and the earth.[39] (7) He has no use for celibacy, detests continence and insists on matrimony. And as though <by> revelation, if you please, he introduced some further figments of his imagination. (8) But he taught hypocrisy, by saying that even though <one> should happen to worship idols in time of persecution, it is not a sin—just so long as he does not worship them in his conscience and, whatever confession he may make with his mouth, he does not make it in his heart.

1,9 In addition the fraud ventured to produce a witness. He said that a Phineas, a priest of the stock of Levi, Aaron, and the ancient Phineas, escaped death in Babylon during the captivity by bowing down to the image of Artemis at Susa in the reign of King Darius. Thus all the things he teaches are false and futile.

2,1 <As has been said> earlier, Elxai was connected with the sect I have mentioned, the one called the Ossaean. Even today there are still remnants of it in Nabataea, which is also called Peraea near Moabitis; this people is now known as the Sampsaean. They imagine that they are calling Elxai a power revealed,[40] if you please, since "el" means "power" but "xai" is "hidden." (2) But the whole of the insolence of the custom[41] was exposed in our own time, and incurred serious disgrace in the eyes of those who were capable of perceiving the truth and being certain of it. (<For the sect> still <survived> even <in our time>, during the reigns of Constantius and the current emperors.) (3) For until Constantius' time a Marthus and a Marthana, two sisters descended from Elxai himself, were worshiped as goddesses in the Ossaean territory—because they were descended from this Elxai, if you please! Yet Marthus has recently died, (though Marthana is still alive)! (4) The deluded sectarians in that country would take even the sisters' spittle away with them, and the other dirt from their bodies, supposedly as a protection against diseases. They surely didn't

[39] The second of these two lists is found at Hipp. Refut. 9.15.2;5. A similar but shorter list, found in the Pseudo-Clementines at Ep. Pet. Jas. 4.1, is heaven, earth, water, air.

[40] ἀποκεκαλυμμένην. The Hebrew כסה means "hide." Is the meaning "a hidden power (which has now been revealed to the elect)"? Amidon, and Klijn and Rinnick, render "hidden power," perhaps from context taking the participle to mean "hidden away"?

[41] I.e., of giving Elxai a divine title. Since one of his "divine" descendants has died, he cannot have been divine.

work! But something that has gone astray is always proud and ready to be fooled—evil is a blind thing, and error a stupid one.

3,1 And how long shall I spend my time in speaking of all this charlatan's lies against the truth—(2) first, by teaching the denial of God and hypocrisy, with his claim that one can participate in the abominable sacrifices of idolatry, deceive the ones who hear him, and deny his own faith with his lips and not incur sin? It follows that their condition is incurable and cannot be corrected. (3) For if the mouth that confesses the truth is already prepared to lie, who can trust them not to have a deceived heart? The divine Word declares this expressly when he teaches in the Holy Spirit, "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation?"[42]

3,4 In turn, moreover, he supposedly confesses Christ by name when he says "Christ is the great king."[43] But from the deceitful, false composition of the book of his foolishness, I am not quite sure whether he taught this of our Lord Jesus Christ. For he does not specify this either but simply says "Christ," as though—from what I can gather—he means someone else, or is awaiting someone else. (5) For he forbids prayer facing east. He claims that one should not face this direction, but should face Jerusalem from all quarters. Some must face Jerusalem from east to west, some from west to east, some from north to south and south to north, so that Jerusalem is faced from every direction. (6) And notice the craziness of the fraud! He bans burnt offerings and sacrifices, as something foreign to God and never offered to him on the authority of the fathers and Law, and yet he says we must pray towards Jerusalem, where the altar and sacrifices were—<this man who> rejects the Jewish custom of eating meat and the rest, and the altar, and fire as something foreign to God! (7) In the following words he claims that water is fortunate while fire is hostile: "Children, go not unto the sight of fire, since ye are deceived; for such a thing is deceit. Thou seest it as very nigh," he says, "and yet it is afar off. Go not unto the sight of it, but go rather unto the sound of water." And he has lots of tall tales.

4,1 Then he describes Christ as a kind of power, and even gives his dimensions—his length of 24 schoena, or 96 miles, and his width of twenty-four miles, or six schoena, and similar prodigies about his thickness and feet, and the other stories. (2) And the Holy Spirit—a feminine one at that—is like Christ too, and stands like an image, above a cloud and

[42] Rom. 10:10
[43] Cf. Hipp. Refut. 9.15.1.

in between two mountains.[44] And I am going to skip the rest, so as not to trick the readers' hearing into mythology.

4,3 Later in the book he practices a deception with certain words and empty phrases by saying, "Let none seek the interpretation but let him say these things only in prayer." These too he has taken from the Hebrew, if you please—as I understand them in part—though Elxai's imaginings are worthless. He claims to say, "Abhar anid moibh nochile daasim ane daasim nochile moibh anid abhar selam." This can be interpreted as follows: (4) "Let the humiliation <which> is from my fathers pass, (the humiliation) of their condemnation, degradation and toil, by degradation in condemnation through my fathers. (Let it pass) from bygone humiliation by an apostleship of perfection."[45] (5) But all this applies to Elxai; his power and imposture have come to nothing.

If anyone cares to hear one word painfully rendered by one word, I do not mind doing even this. For the full satisfaction of those who want to hear them exactly, I shall give his very words, and their translations opposite them, thus: (6) "Abhar": Let it pass away. "Anid": "humiliation." "Moibh": "which is from my fathers." "Nochile": "of their condemnation." "Daasim": "and of their degradation." "Ane": "and of their toil." "Daasim": "by degradation." "Nochile": "in condemnation." "Moibh": "through my fathers." "Anid": "from humiliation." "Abhar": "bygone." "Selam": "in apostleship of perfection."

5,1 This, then, is the sect of those Ossenes, which lives the Jewish life in Sabbath observance, circumcision, and the keeping of the whole Law. Only by renouncing the books <of Moses> does it cause a schism—as the Nasaraeans do—since it differs from the other six of these seven sects. (2) <One text> will be enough to expose its foreignness to God, since the Lord plainly says, "The priests in the temple profane the Sabbath."[46] (3) But what can this profanation of the Sabbath be except that no one did work on the Sabbath, but the priests broke it in the temple by offering sacrifice, and profaned it for the sake of the continual sacrifice of animals?

---

[44] The Jewish document of the sixth century C.E., the Shiʿur Qomah, gives "the dimensions of the Creator" (Cohen p. 221 ff.) in parasangs. See also in Swartz, *Maʿashe Merkavah.* While this might be culturally related to the material in Elxai, there is no obvious literary dependence.

[45] Epiph has misread this as Hebrew, presumably from a Greek transliteration, and given a forced translation. Holl, following M. A. Levy, suggested that the words were an Aramaic formula, אנא מסעד עליכון ביום דינא רבא, "I am your help in the day of the great judgment," written as a palindrome. σελάμ might mean "finish" or even "peace."

[46] Matt. 12:5

5,4 And I shall pass this sect by as well. For again, Elxai is associated with the Ebionites after Christ, as well as with the Nazoraeans, who came later. (5) And four sects have made use of him because they were bewitched by his imposture: Of those <that came> after him, <the> Ebionites <and> Nazoraeans; of those before his time and during it the Ossaeans, and the Nasaraeans whom I mentioned earlier.

5,6 This is the <sixth> sect of the seven in Jerusalem. They persisted until the coming of Christ, and after Christ's incarnation until the capture of Jerusalem by the Emperor Titus, Domitian's brother but Vespasian's son, in the second year of his father Vespasian's reign. (7) And after Jerusalem's fall this, and the other sects which enjoyed a brief period of celebrity—I mean the Sadducees, Scribes, Pharisees, Hemerobaptists, Ossaeans, Nasaraeans and Herodians—lingered on until, at its time and season, each was dispersed and dissolved.

6,1 Any sensible person has only to prepare his own remedy, from their lunacy itself and the words of the proclamation of the deadly poison, despising their vulgar teaching and chatter. (2) Especially as the Lord says at once, in the Law and in the Gospel, "Thou shalt have none other gods,"[47] and, "Thou shalt not swear by the name of any other god."[48] And again he says in the Gospel, "Swear not, neither by heaven, nor by earth, neither any other oath. But let your Yea be Yea, and your Nay, Nay; whatsoever is more that these cometh of the evil one."[49] (3) It is my opinion that the Lord was making a prediction about this because certain persons would command us to swear by other names—in the first place, because it is wrong to swear, by the Lord himself or anything else; swearing is <of> the evil one. (4) Hence it was the evil one who spoke in Elxai—the one who compelled him not only to swear by God, but also by salt, water, <bread>, aether, wind, earth, and heaven. Anyone willing to be cured need only take an antidote, in passing as it were, through the two arguments in opposition to Elxai's imposture.

6,5 Next, passing by Elxai's nonsense and the deceitfulness of this sect, I shall compose the rebuttal of the seventh sect which was current among the Jews of that period. And it is this:

---

[47] Exod 20:3
[48] Cf. Exod 23:13.
[49] Jas 5:12 and Matt 5:37

20.

Against Herodians.[50] *Sect seven from Judaism, but twenty of the series*

1,1 And again, after this sect and the others there was a seventh, called the sect of Herodians. These had nothing different but <were> altogether Jews, good for nothing and hypocrites. They believed, however, that Herod was Christ, thought that the Christ awaited in all scriptures of the Law and prophets was Herod himself, [51](2) and were proud of Herod because they were deceived about him. This was because, (besides holding the vain opinion in order to gratify the reigning king), they were won to it by the wording of the text, "There shall not fail a leader from Judah, nor a ruler out of his loins, till he come for whom it is prepared"[52]—or, "for whom are the things prepared," as the other copies say.

1,3 [53]This was because Herod was the son of an Antipater of Ashkelon, a temple slave of the idol of Apollo. This Antipater's father was named Herod, and he too was the son of an Antipater.

Antipater was taken prisoner by Idumaeans and fathered Herod during his stay in Idumaea. (4) Since his father was poor and could not ransom his son—I mean Antipater—he remained there for a long time as a slave. But later, with his young son Herod, he was ransomed by public subscription and returned home. This is why some call him an Idumaean, though others know he was from Ashkelon.

1,5 Afterwards he made friends with Demetrius,[54] was appointed governor of Judaea, and became acquainted with the Emperor Augustus. Because of his governorship he became a proselyte, was circumcised himself, and circumcised his son, Herod. The rule of the Jews was allotted to Herod and he was king in Judaea as a tributary ruler, under the Emperor Augustus.

1,6 Since this person of gentile extraction was reigning as king, while the crown had come down in succession from Judah and David but the rulers and patriarchs of the tribe of Judah <had come to an end> and the crown had passed over to a gentile, the mistaken belief that he was Christ

---

[50] Herodians are mentioned at PsT 1.1; Fil. 28; Jer. Adv. Lucif. 23; Eus. H. E. 1.6.2-4. This last is probably Epiph's source, though he does not have it before him but is working from memory. On the subject of Epiph's faulty memory of Eusebius, see Pourkier, *L'hérésiologie*.

[51] Cf. PsT 1.1; Fil. 28.

[52] Gen 49:10. For the application of this see Eus. H. E. 1.6.2.

[53] For the following story see Eus. H. E. 1.6.2-4; 1.7.11.

[54] Eus. H. E. 1.6.7 mentions Hyrcanus rather than Demetrius, and says that Herod is appointed governor by the Senate and Augustus after Hyrcanus is taken prisoner by the Parthians.

seemed persuasive to the opinion of the deluded—(7) in consequence of the wording of the text I have quoted, "There shall not fail a ruler from Judah till he come for whom it is prepared."[55] It was as though they were obliged to take it <in the sense of> "It was 'prepared' for this ruler. The rulers from Judah have 'failed,' and this one is not descended from Judah—indeed, is not a descendant of Israel at all. <The> role of Christ was 'prepared' for someone like this."

2,1 But what follows refutes them because it says, "He is the expectation of the nations, and in him shall the peoples hope."[56] Which of the nations "hoped" in Herod? Which "expectation of the nations" awaits Herod? How did they think "He slept as a lion, and as a lion's cub; who shall raise him up?" applied? (2) Where did Herod "wash his garment in blood," or "his covering in the blood of the cluster,"[57] as our Lord Jesus Christ did by spattering his body with his own blood, and his covering with the blood of the cluster? (3) No, "Consider what I say, for the Lord will give thee understanding in all things."[58] For the purification of the whole of the Lord's people he came to cleanse their teeth of men's teaching with his own blood since these had been stained in the blood of fat and unlawful sacrifice. (4) And why should I say the multitudes of things (that suggest themselves)? There are many, and the time I have for the rebuttal of these sects does not permit me to prolong the discussion.

3,1 At all events, these were the seven sects in Israel, in Jerusalem and Judaea, and the four I mentioned in "Samaritans" in Samaria. But most of them have been eliminated. There are no Scribes any longer, no Pharisees, Sadducees, Hemerobaptists or Herodians. (2) There are only a handful of Nasarenes, perhaps one or two, above the Upper Thebaid and beyond Arabia; and the remnant of Ossaeans, no longer practicing Judaism but joined with the Sampsites, who in their turn <live> in the <territory> beyond the Dead Sea. Now, however, they have been united with the sect of the Ebionites. (3) And as a result they have lapsed from Judaism—as though a snake's tail or body had been cut off and a snake with two heads and no tail had sprouted from it, grown on and attached to a body chopped in half.

---

[55] Gen. 49:10.
[56] Gen 49:10b
[57] Gen 49:11
[58] 2 Tim 2:2

3,4 So much for my discussion of the four Samaritan and the seven Jewish sects, none of which exist any longer except just three Samaritan ones, I mean <those of the> Gorothenes, Dositheans and Sebuaeans, but no Essenes at all—as though they have been buried in darkness. And there are no more sects among the Jews except those of the Ossaeans, and a few isolated Nasaraeans. But Ossaeans have abandoned Judaism for the sect of the Sampsaeans, who are no longer either Jews or Christians. That will do for these.

Christ's sojourn here, and the presence of his advent and truth in the flesh, which is the one and only Faith of God (De Incarnatione)

1,1 Right on their heels came the arrival in the flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, which overtook these seven sects at Jerusalem; his power extinguished and scattered them. But then, after his sojourn, all of the later sects arose. I mean they arose after Mary had been given the good tidings at Nazareth by Gabriel and in a word, after the Lord's entire sojourn in the flesh—or in other words, after his ascension.

1,2 For God was pleased that, for man's salvation, his own Son should descend and be conceived in a virgin womb although he was the Word from heaven, begotten in the bosom of the Father, not in time and without beginning but come in the last days; the divine Word truly begotten of God the Father, of one essence with the Father and in no way different from the Father, but immutable and unalterable, impassible and entirely without suffering, though he shared the suffering of our race.

1,3 He came down from heaven and was conceived, not of man's seed but by the Holy Spirit. He had truly received a body from Mary, for he had fashioned his own flesh from the holy Virgin's womb, had taken the human soul and mind and everything human apart from sin, and by his own Godhead united it with himself. (4) He was born in Bethlehem, circumcised in the cavern, presented in Jerusalem, embraced by Simeon, confessed in her turn by Anna the daughter of Phanuel, the prophetess, and taken off to Nazareth.

The following year he came to appear before the Lord in Jerusalem (5) and arrived at Bethlehem borne in his mother's arms, because of (her) kindred (there). Once more he was taken back to Nazareth, and after a second year came to Jerusalem and Bethlehem, borne by his own mother as before. And in Bethlehem he came to a house with his own mother and Joseph, who was an old man but was Mary's companion. And there, in the second

year of his life, he was visited by the magi, was worshiped, received gifts, (6) and was taken to Egypt the same night because an angel had warned Joseph. He came back again from Egypt two years later, since Herod had died and Archelaus had succeeded him.

2,1 The Savior was born at Bethlehem of Judaea in the thirty-third year of Herod,[1] the forty-second of the Emperor Augustus. He went down into Egypt in the thirty-fifth year of Herod and returned from Egypt after Herod's death. (2) And so in the thirty-seventh year of that same reign of Herod, when Herod died after a reign of 37 years, the child was four years old.

2,3 Archelaus ruled for nine years. When Joseph left Egypt with Mary and the child at the beginning of his reign, hearing that Archelaus was king he went back to the Galilee and at this time settled in Nazareth. (4) Archelaus had a son, Herod the Younger,[2] and this Herod succeeded him as king in the ninth year of the reign of his father Archelaus; and the years of Christ's incarnation numbered thirteen.

2,5 In the eighteenth year of Herod surnamed Agrippa Jesus began his preaching and at that time received the baptism of John and preached an "acceptable year" opposed by no one—Jews, Greeks, Samaritans or anyone else. (6) Then he preached a second year, in the face of opposition; and this Herod had reigned for nineteen years while it was the Savior's thirty-second.

2,7 But in the twentieth year of Herod called the tetrarch came the saving passion and impassibility; the tasting of death, even of the death of a cross, of One who truly suffered and yet remained impassible in his divine nature. ("Forasmuch as Christ hath suffered in the flesh for us"[3] says the sacred scripture, and again, "being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit,"[4] and what follows.) (8) He was crucified and buried, descended to the underworld in Godhead and soul, led captivity captive, and rose again the third day with his sacred body itself, having united the body to his Godhead—a body no longer subject to dissolution, no longer suffering, no longer under death's dominion (as the apostle says, "Death hath no more dominion over him?)[5] (3,1) truly the body itself, the

---

[1] Cf. Jer. Chron. 160,1-5 (Helm).

[2] Epiph identifies Herod the Younger with Herod Agrippa, and makes him the son of Archelaus.

[3] 1 Pet 4:1

[4] 1 Pet 3:18

[5] Rom 6:9

flesh itself, the soul itself, the whole humanity itself. He had quickened, not something other than his actual body but his actual body, and united it with one unity, one Godhead: the fleshly imperishable, the bodily spiritual, the gross ethereal, the mortal immortal and never having seen corruption. For the soul had not been left in hell, (2) its instrument not severed from it on sin's account, its mind not defiled by change. He had taken all the characteristics of man and preserved them all entire, since <the> Godhead had bestowed them on the true Manhood for its proper needs. By these I mean the needs <that arise> from a body, soul and human mind, and confirm the fullness of <the true humanity>—(confirm it,) that is, by hunger and thirst, weeping and discouragement, tears and sleep, weariness and repose. (3) For these are no form of sin but a token of truest humanity, since the Godhead truly dwells with the Manhood, the Godhead not undergoing human vicissitudes but consenting to what is proper, and to what is free from sin and forbidden change.

3,4 He arose, moreover, and entered where doors were shut to prove that his solid body was ethereal—though it was his very body itself, with flesh and bones. For after his entry he exhibited his hands and feet, his pierced side, his bones, sinews and the rest, so that the sight they saw was not an illusion, for he was giving the promise of our faith and hope since he had fulfilled all of it himself.[6]

3,5 And he broke bread with them not in appearance in reality, and taught them in his instruction to proclaim the kingdom of heaven in truth, (at the same time) indicating the supreme, crowning <mystery>[7] to his disciples by saying, "Make disciples of the nations"—that is, convert the nations from wickedness to truth, from sects to a single unity—(6) "baptizing them in the name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit."[8] (Baptizing them, that is), by the royal naming of the Trinity, the sacred, kingly seal to show, by the word, "name,"[9] that there has been no alteration of the one Unity.[10] (7) For since he commands the candidates <to be sealed> "in the *name* of Father…" the praise of God is assured. Since he commands this "in the *name* of…Son," the (divine) surname[11] is no less assured. Since he

[6] I.e., exhibiting what the resurrection body will be. Having risen himself, he is qualified to do so.

[7] The sacrament of baptism

[8] Matt 29:19

[9] I.e., the one word ὄνομα in the singular is applied to each of the Persons, meaning that the reference is to only one God.

[10] Because the noun is singular. More than one "name" would imply alteration.

[11] υἱός is here treated as the ἐπίκλησις, or surname, of πατήρ.

commands it "in the *name* of . . . Holy Spirit," the bond, neither cut nor severed, bears the seal of the one Godhead.

4,1 And he was taken up to heaven in his body itself and his soul and mind, conjoining them as one unity and perfecting them as a spiritual, divine entity. He sat down at the Father's right hand after sending messengers into all the world: (2) Simon Peter, his brother Andrew, and James and John the sons of Zebedee, whom he had chosen at the outset—Philip and Bartholomew, Matthew, Thomas and Judas and Thaddeus, Simon the Zealot. For though Judas Iscariot had originally belonged to the twelve, he turned traitor and was stricken from the sacred roll of the apostles.

4,3 And he sent seventy-two others as well to preach, among whom were the seven who were put in charge of the widows, Stephen, Philip, Prochorus, Nicanor, Timon, Parmenas and Nicolaus—(4) but before them was Matthias, who was included among the apostles in place of Judas. After these seven, and Matthias who preceded them, he sent Mark and Luke, Justus, Barnabas and Apelles, Rufus, Niger and <the> rest of the seventy-two. (5) After them all, and along with them, he chose the holy apostle Paul with his own voice from heaven to be at once apostle and herald of the gentiles and the one to complete the apostolic doctrine. (6) It was Paul who found St. Luke, one of the seventy-two who had been scattered, brought him to repentance, and <made him> his own follower, both a co-worker in the Gospel and an apostle. And in this way all of the work of preaching the Gospel has been done, down to this time.

4,7 So much for my discussion of the twenty Sects, and the sequel to them which I have given as briefly as I could: the bringing of the light of the Gospel into the world by Christ and his disciples. (8) Similarly, it would be possible to gather and cite oracles and prophecies from the Law and Psalms, observe the passages and the proofs in the other scriptures, and understand precisely how Christ's incarnation and evangelical teaching are not spurious, but are true, were announced beforehand by the Old Testament, and are open to no doubt. But not to make the work of composition too long a job, I shall rest content with this.

4,9 Moving on now, I am similarly going to describe the opinions which sprouted up in the world later for a wrong reason. I have already given a fairly good enumeration of the eleven that originated with the Jews and Samaritans and the nine that originated with the Greeks, the barbarians and the others before the Lord's advent and until his time.

ANACEPHALAEOSIS II

Here in turn are the contents of this second Section of Volume One. It includes thirteen Sects as follows:

21,1 21. Simonians, the sect founded by Simon the magician from the Samaritan village of Gitthon, who lived during the time of the apostle Peter. He was Samaritan in origin and adopted Christ's name only. (2) He taught that an unnatural act, sexual congress for the pollution of women, is a matter of moral indifference. He rejected the resurrection of bodies, and claimed that the world is not God's. (3) He gave his disciples an image of himself in the form of Zeus to worship, and one <in the> form of Athena of the whore named Helen who accompanied him. He said that he was the Father to Samaritans, but Christ to Jews.

22,1 22. Menandrians, who originated from this Simon through a Menander, but were somewhat different from the Simonians. Menander said that the world was made by angels.

23,1 23. Satornilians, who lent support to the Simonians' pornography throughout Syria, but preached differently from the Simonians in order to create a further sensation. Their founder was Satornilus. (2) He too, like Menander, said that the world was made by angels—but only by seven—against the wishes of the Father on high.

24,1 24. Basilideans, votaries of the same obscenity, derived from Basilides who, together with Satornilus, was trained by the Simonians and Menandrians. He held similar views but was somewhat different. (2) He said that there are 365 heavens, and gave angelic names for them. Thus the year too has the same number of days, and the name, Abrasax, has the same numerical value and totals 365. And he says that this is the holy name.

25,1 25. Nicolaitans, founded by the Nicolaus who was placed placed in charge of the widows by the apostles. From envy of his own wife he taught his disciples, along with the others, to perform the obscene act, (2) and taught them about Kaulakau, Prunicus, and other outlandish names.

26,1 26. Gnostics are the successors of these sects, but insanely perform the obscene action more than all of them. In Egypt they are called Stratiotics and Phibionites; in Upper Egypt, Secundians; in other places, Socratists, and Zacchaeans in others. (2) But others call them Coddians, others, Borborites. They boast of Barbelo, who is also known as Barbero.

27,1 27. Carpocratians, founded by one Carpocrates, a native of Asia, who taught his followers to perform every obscenity and every sinful practice.

And unless one progresses through all of them, he said, and fulfills the will of all the demons and angels, he cannot mount to the highest heaven or get by the principalities and authorities.

27,2 He said that Jesus had received an intellectual soul, knew what is on high and made it known here; and that if one does things like the things that Jesus did, he is like Jesus. (3) Like the sects from Simon on, Carpocrates repudiated the Law together with the resurrection of the dead. (4) Marcellina at Rome was a follower of his. He secretly made images of Jesus, Paul, Homer and Pythagoras, burned incense to them and worshiped them.

28. Cerinthians, also known as Merinthians. These are a type of Jew derived from Cerinthus and Merinthus, and boast of circumcision, but say that the world was made by angels and that Jesus was named Christ as an advancements.

29. Nazoraeans, who confess that Christ Jesus is Son of God, but all of whose customs are in accordance with the Law.

30,1 30. Ebionites are very like these Cerinthians and the Nazoraeans; and the sect of the Sampsaeans and Elkasaites was associated with them to a degree.

30,2 They say that Christ was created in heaven, also the Holy Spirit. But Christ lodged in Adam at first, and from time to time takes Adam himself off and puts him on again—for this is what they say he did at the time of his advent in the flesh.

30,3 Although they are Jews they have Gospels, abhor the eating of flesh, take water for God, and, as I said, hold that Christ clothed himself with a man at the time of his advent in the flesh. (4) They immerse themselves in water regularly, summer and winter for supposed purification, like the Samaritans.

31,1 31. Valentinians, who deny the resurrection of the flesh and, although they read the Old Testament and prophets, accept (only) such things as can be interpreted allegorically to sound like their own sect. (2) They accept and introduce some other tales as well and give names of thirty aeons, which are male and female and were begotten all together by the Father of all, and which they hold to be both gods and aeons. (3) Christ has brought a body from heaven, and passed through Mary as though through a conduit.

32,1 32. Secundians, with whom Epiphanes and Isidore are associated, also believe in the same pairs of aeons; for their ideas are like Valentinus', though to a certain extent they teach different things. (2) In addition, they teach the performance of the obscene act. They too repudiate the flesh.

33 33. Ptolemaeans, also disciples of Valentinus, with whom Flora is associated. They say the same things about the pairs of aeons as the Valentinus and the Secundians do, but they too are different to some extent.

This, in turn, is the summary of the thirteen Sects of the second Section of Volume One.

21.
Against Simonians,[1] *first after the only Faith of Christ, but twenty-one of the series*

1,1 Simon Magus's makes the first sect to arise in the time between Christ and ourselves. It is made up of people who do not rightly or lawfully <believe> in Christ's name, but perform their dreadful activities in keeping with the false corruption that is in them.

1,2 Simon was a sorcerer, and came from Gitthon,[2] the city in Samaria—though it is a village now. He deluded the Samaritan people by deceiving and catching them with his feats of magic, (3) and said that he was the supreme power of God and had come down from on high.[3] To the Samaritans he called himself the Father; but to Jews he said he was the Son,[4] though he had suffered without suffering, but suffered only in appearance.[5]

1,4 Simon made up to the apostles and, together with many he too, like the others, was baptized by Philip. All except Simon waited for the arrival of the chief apostles, and received the Holy Spirit through the laying on of their hands. (Philip, being a deacon, did not have the faculty of the laying on of hands in order to give the Holy Spirit through it.) (5) Now since

---

[1] Epiph's main source for this Sect is Hipp. Synt., the content of which is also reflected by PsT 1.2 and Fil. 29.1. He also makes use of Irenaeus. The account of Simon found at Eus. H. E. 2.12.3-15.1 is based on Justin and Irenaeus and some version of the debate between Simon and Peter. Hippol. Refut. 6.7; 19.1-20.2 may come in large part from Irenaeus; Tert. De Anima 34 surely does.

The oldest accounts of Simon are found at Justin Apol. 26.2-3; 56.1-2 and Dial. 120.6. Clem. Recog. 2.5-15 gives a fundamentally different version of his biography; Const. Ap. 6.7-9 draws on some version of this latter account. See also Orig. Cels. 5.62. There may be NHC allusions or references to the Simonians at Apoc. Pet. 74,28-34 and Test. Tr. 58,2-4.

[2] Justin Apol. 26.2; Hipp. Refut. 6.7.1; Clem. Recog. 2.7.1; Hom. 2.22; Fil. 29.1; Const. Ap. 6.7.

[3] Acts 8:9; Justin Apol. 26.2; Hipp. Refut. 6.7.1; Iren. 1.23.1; PsT 1.2; Fil.29.1.4.

[4] Iren. 1.23.3; Hipp. Refut. 6.19.6; Fil. 29.2; Tert. De Anima 34. Hippolytus and Irenaeus both say Simon claims to have appeared to gentiles as the Holy Spirit; Epiph omits this, probably because he believes Simon called Helen the Holy Spirit, see 21,2,3-4.

[5] Iren 1.23.1; Hipp. Refut. 6.19.6; Fil. 29.3

Simon's heart was not right or his reason either, but he was addicted to a sordid covetousness and avarice and was certainly not ready to abandon his evil practice, he offered money to Peter the apostle, to give him the faculty of conveying the Holy Spirit through the laying on of hands. For he had counted on spending a little money, and amassing a huge fortune and more in return for a small investment, by giving the Holy Spirit to others.[6]

2,1 Since his mind was deranged and deluded by the devilish deceit in magic, and he was always ready to display the barbarous deeds of his own wickedness and demon's wickedness through his magic arts,[7] he came out in the open and, under the appearance of Christ's name, induced death in his converts by slipping a poison into the dignity of Christ's name—as though he were mixing hellebore with honey—for those whom he had trapped in his baneful error.

2,2 Since the tramp was naturally lecherous, and was encouraged by the respect that had been shown to his professions, he trumped up a phony allegory for his dupes. He had gotten hold of a female vagabond from Tyre named Helen, and he took her without letting his relationship with her be known.[8] (3) And while privately having an unnatural relationship with his paramour, the charlatan was teaching his disciples stories[9] for their amusement and calling himself the supreme power of God, if you please! And he had the nerve to call the whore who was his partner the Holy Spirit, and said that he had come down on her account.[10] (4) He said, "I was transformed in each heaven in accordance with the appearance of the inhabitants of each, so as to pass my angelic powers[11] by unnoticed and descend to Ennoia[12]—to this woman, likewise called Prunicus and Holy

---

[6] Acts 8:12-19; Iren. 1.23.1; PsT 1.2; Tert. De Anima 34

[7] Cf. Hipp. Refut. 6.7.1 τὰ μὲν παίξας πολλοὺς κατὰ τὴν Θρασυμύδους τέχνην… τὰ δὲ διὰ δαιμόνων κακουργήσας; Iren. 1.23.1; Fil. 29.1; Tert. De Anima 34; Clem. Rec. 2.7.

[8] Justin Apol. 26.3; Iren. 1.23.2; Hipp. Refut. 6.19.3-4; Tert. De Anima 34.2; Orig. Cels. 5.62

[9] Cf. Hipp. Refut. 6.19.4 ἐρασθεὶς τοῦ γυναίου… τοὺς μαθητὰς αἰδούμενος τοῦτον τὸν μῦθον ἔπλασεν

[10] Just. Apol. 26.3; Iren. 1.23.3; Hipp. Refut. 6.19.4; Fil. 29.7; Tert. De Anima 34.3; PsT 1.2. At Tri. Prot. 40,8-18 the Protennoia descends for the sake of the conquered Sophia.

[11] The redeemer changes form or becomes invisible during his descent at Hippol. Refut. 6.19.6; Iren. 1.23.3; 30,12; Epist. Apost. 13; Gos. Phil. 57,28-58,2; Gr. Seth 56,21-32; Zost. 4,29-30; Tri. Prot. 49,15-23; PS 1.7 (MacDermot p. 12). The direct quotes which Epiph gives in this Sect are his own dramatization of his sources.

[12] In NHC Ennoia is often the first emanation of the invisible God and a synonym for Barbelo. See Apocry. Jn. BG 8502,2 where, among other things, she is "the power who is before the All… the perfect πρόνοια of the All… the image of the invisible One, the perfect power, Barbelo (at II,1 4,36 "the glory of Barbelo)… the first thought, his image." Cf. Zost. 82,23-83,24; Norea 27,11. At II,1 30,11-31,4 she descends three times into the prison of the body. Her descent is elaborately worked out in NHC XIII,1, where she is the

Spirit,[13] through whom I created the angels.[14] But the angels created the world and men. But this woman is the ancient Helen on whose account the Trojans and Greeks went to war."[15]

2,5 Simon told a fairy tale about this, and said that the power kept transforming her appearance on her way down from on high,[16] and that the poets had spoken of this in allegories. For these angels went to war over the power from on high—they call her Prunicus, but she is called Barbero or Barbelo[17] by other sects—because she displayed her beauty <and> drove them wild, and was sent for this purpose, to despoil the archons who had made this world. She has suffered no harm, but she brought them to the point of slaughtering each other from the lust for her that she aroused in them.[18] (6) And detaining her so that she should not go back up,[19] they all had relations with her[20] in each of her womanly and female bodies—for she kept migrating[21] from female bodies into various bodies of human beings, cattle and the rest—so that, by the deeds they were doing in killing and being killed, they would cause their own diminution through the shedding of blood. Then, by gathering the power[22] again, she would be able to ascend to heaven once more.

Trimorphic Protennoia (First Ennoia); see Tri. Prot. 36,4-9; 40,12-18; 40,29-41,1; 41,20-24; 32-25; 42,17-18; 47,11-13; 17-22; 47,12-22 and Turner's Introduction in Hedrick, *Nag Hammadi Codices XI, XII, and XIII*. "Hypsiphrone" descends at Hyps. 70,14-17, the NHC tractate of this name.

[13] The Holy Spirit is equated with Prunicus at Iren. 1.29.4. Here Epiph has equated both the Holy Spirit and Prunicus with Simon's Ennoia.

[14] Iren. 1.23.2; Hipp. Refut. 6.19.3; PsT 1.2; Fil. 29.4. At Gos. Phil. 63,30 "Barren Wisdom" is the "mother of the angels."

[15] Iren. 1.23.3; Hipp. Ref. 6.19.2; Tert. De Anima 3.4-5

[16] The female revealer disguises herself at Apocry. Jn. 30,11-13;3 49,15-23.

[17] Barbelo appears in seven NHC tractates, mostly Sethian, and in Gos. Jud. She is regularly the first emanation of the highest God and is often called his first Thought as at Apocry. Jn. II,1 4,27; 5,4-6; Allog. 53,27-28; Tri. Prot. 38,8-9. She is an "aeon" (Zost. 14,27 et al.; Allog. 53,22-28 et al; Gos. Jud. 35,17-18. She is as it were the source of the other aeons, see Apocry. Jn. II,1 5,4-6: This is the first Thought, his image, she became the womb of everything, for she is prior to them all.

In this sense, "Simon's" "through whom I created the angels" is not inappropriate. However, Barbelo does not descend, suffer or weep; Epiph confuses her role with that of Sophia.

[18] Hipp. Refut. 6.19.2; cf. Manichaean Keph. 35,15-17; 80,25-29. There may be allusions to the idea at Thunder 18,23-25 or Apoc. Pet. 74,27-34.

[19] Iren. 1.23.2; Fil. 29.7; Orig. Wld. 116,15-18; PS 1.30 (MacDermot pp. 43-45. At Apocry. Jn. II,1 30,12-21 Pronoia enters the "prison," but has to hide "because of their wickedness."

[20] Hipp. Refut. 6.19.2; Orig. Wld. 116,15-20; Exeg. Soul 127,25-128,1

[21] Iren. 1.23.2; Hippol. Refut. 6.19.2; Tert. De Anima 34.6. At Tri. Prot. 45,21-27 the Protennoia hides herself in everyone and transforms their forms into other forms.

[22] Cf. Apocry Jn. II,1 19,15-31, "And when the mother wanted to retrieve the power

3,1 "This woman was then, she who by her unseen powers has made replicas of herself[23] in Greek and Trojan times and immemorially, before the world and after. (2) She is the one who is with me now, and for her sake I am come down. But she herself awaited my arrival; for this is Ennoia, she whom Homer calls Helen.[24] And this is why Homer is obliged to describe her as standing on a tower, signaling her plot against the Phrygians to the Greeks with a lamp.[25] But with its brightness, as I said, he indicated the display of the light from on high."

3,3 Thus again, the charlatan said that the wooden horse, the device in Homer which Greeks believe was made as a ruse, is the ignorance of the gentiles.[26] And "as the Phrygians, in drawing it, unwittingly invited their own destruction, so the gentiles—the persons who are outside of my knowledge—draw destruction on themselves through ignorance."

3,4 In turn, what is more, the impostor would say that this same woman whom he called Ennoia was Athena, using the words of the holy apostle Paul if you please, and turning the truth into his falsehood—the words, "Put on the breastplate of faith and the helmet of salvation, the greaves, the sword and the shield."[27] In the style of Philistion's mimes the cheat now turned all these things, which the apostle had said with reference to firm reason, the faithfulness of chaste behavior, and the power of divine, heavenly discourse, into a mere joke. "What else?"he said. "Paul was describing all these things symbolically, as types of Athena."[28] (5) Thus again he would say, meaning, as I said, that woman with him whom he had taken from Tyre, the namesake of the ancient Helen, calling her by all these names—Ennoia, Athena, Helen and the rest—"For her sake I am come down. For this is that which is written in the Gospel, the sheep that was lost.[29]

---

which she had given to the Chief Ruler, she petitioned the Mother-Father of the All…" etc. Yaltabaoth is then persuaded to blow the power into Adam.

[23] This seems to be Epiph's own interpretation of Ennoia's transmigrations.

[24] Iren. 1.23.2; Hippol. Refut. 6.19.1-3; Fil. 29.5-7; Tert. De Anima 34.5

[25] Hipp. Refut. 6.19.1. An analogous though considerably different story about "Luna" is found at Clem. Recog. 2.12.4.

[26] Hippol. Refut. 6.19.1; Fil. 29.8. For the Trojan horse see Vergil Aeneid 6.515-519.

[27] Cf. Eph. 6:14-17.

[28] This may be Epiph's own conjecture, based on the image of Athena which he mentions at 21,3,6.

[29] Matt 18:12 parr.; Iren. 1.23.2; Hippol. Refut. 6.19.2; Tert. De Anima 34.4. This is the "allegory" referred to above.

3,6 Furthermore, he has given his followers an image, supposed to be one of himself, and they worship this in the form of Zeus. He has likewise given them another, an image of Helen in the form of Athena, and his dupes worship (both of) these.[30]

4,1 He instituted mysteries consisting of dirt[31] and, to put it politely, the fluids that flow from bodies—men's through the seminal emission and women's through the regular menses, which are gathered as mysteries by a most indecent method of collection. (2) And he said that these are mysteries of life <and> the fullest knowledge. But for anyone to whom God has given understanding, knowledge is above all a matter of regarding these things as abomination instead, and death rather than life.

4,3 This man offers certain names of principalities and authorities too, and he says that there are various heavens, describes powers to go with each firmament and heaven, and gives outlandish names for them.[32] He says that one cannot be saved unless he learns this catechism and how to offer sacrifices of this kind to the Father of all, through these principalities and authorities. (4) This world has been defectively[33] constructed by wicked principalities and authorities, he says. But he teaches that there is a decay and destruction of flesh, and a purification only of souls—and of these (only) if they are established in their initiation through his erroneous "knowledge". And thus the <imposture> of the <so-called> Gnostics begins.[34]

4,5 He claimed that the Law is not God's[35] but the law of the lefthand power, and that prophets are not from a good God either, but from one power or another. And he specifies a power for each as he chooses—the Law belongs to one, David to another, Isaiah to another, Ezekiel to still another, and he attributes each particular prophet to one principality.[36] But

---

[30] Iren. 1.23.4.; Hipp. Refut. 6.20.9

[31] Epiph means the practice he describes at 26,4,5-5,1 in connection with the "Gnostics". Since he believes that all heresy stems from Simon and, in any case, Irenaeus and probably Hippolytus accuse Simonians of immorality, Epiph feels justified in making this assumption.

[32] Tert. Praescr. 33

[33] ἐν ἐλαττώματι, which seems here to mean no more than "faultily." See n. 9 p. 170.

[34] That is, Simon is the author of Gnosticism. Cf. Iren. 1.23.2 ex quo universae haereses substiterunt; Hippol. Refut. 6.20.4 which makes Simon Valentinus' resource.

[35] This idea is attributed to Simon at Clem Hom. 3.2.2.

[36] Iren. 1.23.3 and especially 1.30.11; Hippol. Refut. 6.19.7. At PS 3.135 (MacDermot p. 351) it is the archons of the aeons who speak to the prophets.

all of these are from the power on the left[37] and outside of the Pleroma;[38] and whoever believes the Old Testament is subject to death.

5,1 But this doctrine is refuted by the truth itself. If Simon is the supreme power of God and the tart he has with him is the Holy Spirit, as he says himself, then he should give the name of the power—or else say why a title has been found for the woman, but none at all for himself! (2) And how does it happen that Simon went the way of all flesh one day at Rome when his turn came—when the wretch fell down and died in the middle of the city of Rome?[39]

5,3 <And> why did Peter declare that Simon has no part or share in the heritage of true religion? (4) And how can the world not belong to a good God, when all the good have been chosen from it?

5,5 And how can the power which spoke in the Law and the prophets be "lefthand", when it has heralded Christ's coming <from the> good God in advance and forbids all wrongdoing? (6) And how can there not be one Godhead and the same Spirit, of the New Testament and of the Old, since the Lord has said, "I am not come to destroy the Law, but to fulfill"?[40] And to show that the Law was delivered by himself and proclaimed through Moses, while the grace of the Gospel has been preached by himself and his advent in the flesh, he told the Jews, "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me also, for he wrote of me."[41]

5,7 And many other arguments <can be found> in opposition to the charlatan's drivel. How can unnatural acts be lifegiving, unless perhaps it is the will of demons, when the Lord himself in the Gospel speaks in reply to those who told him, "If the case of the man and wife be so, it is not good to marry," and he said to them, "All men cannot receive this, for there be eunuchs which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake,"[42]—and proved that true abstention from marriage is

---

[37] In NHC good and evil, or the realms of spirit and matter, are very commonly characterized as "right" and "left": See Gos. Tr. 31,36-32,14; Tri. Trac. 98,12-20; 104, 9-11; 106,2-5; 18-21; Gos. Phil. 53,14-15; Nat. Arc. 95,35-96,3; Test. Tr. 43,10-12; Val Exp. 38,27-33. See also PS 4.139;140 (MacDermot pp. 361-363); U 19 (MacDermot p. 261). At Gos. Phil. 60,26-32 both "right" and "left" are said to have their proper places.

[38] PS 3.135 (MacDermot p. 351) makes it clear that no prophet has yet entered the light, though they will in the future.

[39] At Fil. 29.9 Simon is said to die at Rome percussus ab angelo. For his fall see Const. Ap. 6.9.3-4; Acts of Peter 32 (H-S II p. 313). At Hippol. Refut. 6.23.3 his disciples are said to have buried him alive at Gittha in the vain expectation of his resurrection.

[40] Matt 5:17

[41] John 5:46

[42] Matt 19:10

the gift of the kingdom of heaven? (8) And again, of the lawful wedlock which Simon himself shamefully corrupts to make provision for his own lust, he says elsewhere, "Those whom God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."[43]

6,1 Again, why does the swindler refute himself by overlooking his own nonsense, as though he does not know what he has previously said? After saying that the angels were created by himself through his Ennoia, he said in turn that he was transformed at each heaven so as to escape their notice during his descent. In other words he was evading them from fear; and why is the driveler afraid of the angels he made himself?

6,2 And how can it not be perfectly easy for the wise to expose his secret sowing of error when the scripture says, "In the beginning *God* created the heaven and the earth?"[44] And in agreement with this statement the Lord in the Gospel as though speaking to his own God and Father, says, "Father, Lord of heaven and the earth."[45] (3) Now if the maker of heaven and earth is God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, there is nothing to any of the humbug Simon's assertions—that the world was produced defectively by angels, and all the other random things the impostor insanely told the world and deceived certain persons, the people he duped.

7,1 And these things which I have said briefly about his sect will suffice my readers as an occasion of truth and healing, and for the refutation of those who are trying to harm the ignorant with such beastly filth. (2) Having crushed his poison fangs sufficiently I shall pass them by and go on in turn to the refutation of another sect. For there is inconstancy and uncertainty in him, since he is an impostor but has assumed the appearance of the name of Christ—like the snake-like filth of the aborted issue which is hatched from the infertile eggs of asps and other vipers. (3) As the prophet says, "They have broken the eggs of asps, and he who would eat of their eggs hath found an egg infertile, and in it a basilisk."[46]

But beloved, now that, as I have said, by Christ's power we have struck Simon with the words of the truth and done for his corruption, let us go on to the rest.

---

[43] Matt 19:6
[44] Gen 1:1
[45] Matt 11:25 par.
[46] Isa 59:5

22.
Against Menander[1]
Sect two from Christ's Advent, but twenty-two of the series

1,1 One Menander follows next after this sect. He was Samaritan[2] and was Simon's pupil at one time. He likewise said that the world is the creation of angels,[3] and he said that he himself had been sent from on high as a power of God.[4] (2) To perpetrate worse trickery than his predecessor for men's deception, he said that he had been sent "for salvation"[5]—supposedly to gather certain persons into his own mystery,[6] so that they would not be ruled over by the angels, pincipalities and authorities who have made the world. (3) He wove everything together like his own teacher and never desisted from his reliance on on spells and the other magic arts.

2,1 But he has incurred the same defeat that his teacher has and will be overthrown by the same refutation of the words of the truth. For <he has died> and his sect has mostly gone out of existence. (2) I shall pass it by, proceed with my instruction and go on to another. Indeed, the ancients tell the story that of the many asps that were collected in a single earthen jar and buried in the foundations of the four corners of each temple of the idols that was erected in Egypt, the one that was stronger than the others would set upon them and eat them. (3) But when it was left by itself and could get no food it would bend round and eat <the whole> of its body, from its tail up to a certain part. And so it remained, no longer whole but half of a snake. (4) Hence they called it an "aspidogorgon," showing us that, though there was such a thing long ago, now it no longer exists; it has been wiped out. In the same way, while this entirely defunct sect has been opposed by myself, it has been wiped out by the power of Christ. Let us pass it by too, beloved, and go on to the rest.

---

[1] The probable source of this Sect is Hipp. Synt., assuming that this is echoed by PsT 1.3 and Fil. 30. Epiph also draws on Iren. 1.23.5. For other references see Justin Apol. 26.4; Hipp. Refut. 7.4; Tert De Anima 50. Eus. H. E. 4.7.3-4, which depends upon Justin, mentions Menander as the source of Saturninus' doctrines.

[2] Iren. 1.23.5; Justin Apol. 26.4

[3] Iren. 1.23.5; Hippol. Refut. 7.4

[4] Iren. 1.23.5; Tert. De Anima 50.2

[5] Iren. 1.23.5: missus sit . . . salvatorem pro salute hominum negans habere posse quemquam salutem, nisi in nomine suo bapizatus fuisset; cf. PsT 1.3; Tert. De Anima 50.2.

[6] I.e., his baptism. See the references in n. 5.

23.
Against Satornilus,[1] *number three from The Lord's Advent but twenty-three of the series*

1,1 A Satornilus arose after him taking his own cue from those people, I mean from Menander and his predecessors. Satornilus lived near Syria—that is, near Antioch by Daphne—and brought lots of the theory and practice of deceit into the world.

1,2 For these two, Basilides and Satornilus, were fellow students. Basilides went to Egypt, and preached the dark recesses of the depth of his imposture there. But Satornilus spent his life in the place I have just mentioned,[2] and like Menander declared that the world was made by angels.

1,3 He said that there is one unknowable Father, and that he has made powers, principalities and authorities.[3] But the angels are at odds with[4] the power on high, and a certain seven of them have made the world and everything in it.[5] The world, however, has been parceled out by lot to each of the angels.[6]

1,4 These angels met and deliberated, and created the man together, in the form of the luminous image that had peeped down from on high—for, not being able to detain it when it peeped down because it withdrew suddenly, they wanted to make a reproduction of it.[7] (5) And the man was fashioned by them, for no other reason but this one. For since this light had somehow stimulated these angels when it peeped down from on high, from longing for the likeness on high they undertook to fashion the man.

---

[1] The outline of this Sect comes from Hipp. Synt, as a reading of PsT 1.4 suggests. Much material from Iren. 1.24 has been inserted. Hipp. Refut. 7.28.3 might come from Iren. Fil. 31 may be drawn either from Hipp. Synt or from Epiph, or from both. See also Eus. H. E. 4.22.5 (from Hegesippus); Justin Dial. 35.6; Tert. De Anima 23.1; Const. Apost. 6.8.1.

[2] Basilides and Saturninus, or Satornilus, are also paired at Iren. 1.24.1; Hipp. Refut. 7.28.1; Eus. H. E. 4.7.3.

[3] The wording to this point is closest to that of Iren. 1.24.1; cf. Hipp. Refut. 7,28.1-2. PsT 1.4. and Fil. 31.1 only imply the idea.

[4] διεστάναι. That Epiph means "disagree, be at variance" is suggested by the content of 2,2; 4,1-2. PsT, however, has longe distanter ab hoc (deo). Amidon: The angels parted from the upper power.

[5] So worded at Iren. 1.24.1. Cf. Hipp. Refut. 7.28.2. "Made the world" without "and everything in it" is found at PsT 1.4; Fil. 31.1; cf. Acts of Paul 8.1.15 (H-S II p. 254).

[6] An angelic "prince" is in charge of every nation at Dan 10:13; 18-20. Cf. Gos. Egyp. III,2 58,3-5: And (Sakla) said to the [great angels] "Go and let each of you reign over his world."

[7] For the withdrawal of the light see Tri. Trac. 79,10-13; Nat. Arc. 94,29-39; Orig. Wld. 103,29-32; Zost. 27,12.

(6) For since they had fallen in love with the light from on high,[8] and were held spellbound with desire for it and enjoyment of it when it appeared and (then) disappeared from them—being in love with it and yet unable to sate themselves with its loveliness, because of the immediate withdrawal of this light—this charlatan represents the angels in his skit as having said, "Let us make man in the image and after the likeness."[9]

1,7 To lend plausibility to his imposture he has excised the word, "our" which was used in Genesis by the holy God, <but> retained "in the image," as though, if you please, some persons were making an image of someone else, and <showing this by> saying, "Let us make a man in *an* image and after *a* likeness."

1,8 But once the man was made, he says, they could not finish him because of their weakness. He lay quivering, flat on the ground like a worm with no legs, unable to stand up or do anything else, until the power on high peeped down, had compassion because of its own image and semblance, and out of pity sent a spark of its power, raised the man up with this, and so brought him to life;[10] Satornilus claims, if you please, that the spark is the human soul.[11]

1,9 And thus the spark is sure to be preserved, but the whole of the man must perish. What has come down from on high will sooner or later be received back on high, but what is from below, everything the angels have fashioned, is left here for them.[12]

1,10 The charlatan claims that Christ himself has come only in the form and semblance of man, and has done everything in appearance—being born, living a human life, being visible, suffering.[13]

---

[8] The desire for the image in the waters is erotic at Nat. Arc. 87,11-14; Corp. Herm. 1.14, and Fil. 31.2, who might be drawing on Epiph for this point.

[9] Cf. Gen 1:26. This exegesis of Gen 1:26, which makes use of the plural "Let *us* make man", is a common one in Gnostic and similar sources. In NHC see Apocry. Jn. II,1 14,.24-15,6; Nat. Arc. 87,11-88.3; Or. Wld. 100,21-22; 103,29-32; Gr. Pow. 38,5-9. *Ginza* 174,1-6 has a similar story, and cf. Corp. Herm. 1.14.

The word, "our" is also omitted at Iren. 1.24.1; Hipp. Refut. 7.28.2, PsT 1.4; Gos. Jud. 52,14-17; Let. Pet. 136,7-10; Cod. Tch. Let. Pet. 4,14-17; Irenaeus 1.30.6 (Ophites). Fil. 31.3 inserts it. Apocry. Jn. II,1 15,2-3 reads: 'Come, let us create a man according to the image *of God* and according to *our* likeness.'

[10] Iren. 1.24.1; 1.30.6; Hipp. Refut. 7.28.3; Fil. 31.4. Comparable exegeses of Gen 1:27 appear at Gos. Tr. 30,16-32; Apocry. Jn. II,1 19,10-33; Nat. Arc. 88,3-17; Or. Wld. 115,3-116,8.

[11] The spark is important at Para. Shem 31,22-23; 46,13-15. Only Epiph explicitly identifies this spark as the soul.

[12] Iren. 1.24.1. Cf. Hipp. Refut. 7.28.4; Fil. 31.5; Auth. Teach 32,16-23.

[13] Hipp. Refut. 7.28.4; Iren. 1.24.2; PsT l.3; Fil. 31. Teachings which might be termed docetic or quasi-docetic are found at 1 Apoc. Jas. 30,2-6; 31,14-22; 2 Apoc. Jas. 57,10-19; Cod. Tch. James 16,15-21; 18,6-11; Acts of John 87-97 (H-S II pp. 179-185).

2,1 From him "knowledge," as it is falsely called, begins again to add to the depth of its wickedness. It found its origin and occasion in Simon, but (now) it is augmented with other, further nonsense, whose refutation I shall give later. (2) For Satornilus claims when speaking of the angels that the God of the Jews is one of them too, and that he and they are at odds with the power on high. But the Savior has been sent from the Father against the power's wishes, for the destruction of the God of the Jews and the salvation of those who trust in <him>.[14] And they, the members of this sect, are the ones who have the spark of the Father on high.

2,3 For Satornilus claims that two men were fashioned at the first, one good and one evil. Descended from these are two breeds of men in the world, the good and the evil. (4) But since the demons were assisting the evil, for this reason the Savior came, as I said, in the last days, to the aid of the good men and for the destruction of the evil and the demons.[15]

2,5 This tramp also says that marriage and procreation are of Satan, so that the majority of them abstain from meat, to attract certain persons to their deceit, if you please, with this pretended asceticism.[16] (6) Again, the charlatan claims that some of the prophecies were delivered by the angels who made the world, but some by Satan. For Satan too is an angel, he claims, who acts in opposition to the angels who made the world, but especially to the God of the Jews.[17]

3,1 But whenever the oaf makes these claims he himself will surely be shown to be confessing one God, and tracing all things to one monarchy. For if the angels have made <the man>, but angels in turn have as the cause of their being the power on high, then they are not the causes of the fashioning of the man. This must be the power on high which made the angels by whom the fashioning of the man was done.[18] (2) For the tool is not the cause of the products it makes, but the person who, with the tool, performs the operation by which the product is made. As scripture says, "Shall the axe boast itself without him who wieldeth it?"[19] and so on. (3) Thus we see that the sword is not the cause of the murder, but the person who undertook the murder with the sword. And the mold cannot make the vessels itself, but the one who made the mold and the vessels can.[20]

---

[14] Iren. 1.24.2. cf. Hipp. Refut. 7.28.5; A polemic against the OT God and his teachings is found at Test. Truth 47,14-50,11.

[15] Iren. 1.24.2; Hipp. Refut. 7.28.6.

[16] Iren. 1.24.2; cf. Hipp. Refut. 7.28.7.

[17] Iren. 1.24.2; cf. Hipp. Refut. 7.28.7.

[18] This argument, which Epiph uses in several connections, is found at Iren. 2.2.3.

[19] Isa 10:15

[20] Irenaeus at 2.2.3 uses the illustrations of a battle, a saw and an axe.

3,4[21] Hence the angels are not the cause, but the angels' maker is the cause, even though it did <not> order them to make a man. (5) It may be that Satornilus is accusing the power on high of ignorance, and unawareness of the things that were going to be done against its will. Or else <he is saying> that it was with its consent, for a useful purpose, that the angels prepared the man, even though it did not order them to finish the project—that is, the model of the man, as we learn from Satornilus' mythological construct.

4,1 Or why not reply to the myth-maker with the question, "Did the power on high know what they would do?"

"Yes," he says.

"Very well, if it knew, then it, not they, made the man,. And if it knew but didn't want it done, and they still undertook the project themselves against its wishes, why didn't it stop them? (2) But if it had no way of stopping them, this is its first fault. It created the angels it has made to its own disadvantage, in opposition to itself and for its own provocation; and in the second place, it could have stopped them but didn't, and instead lent its assistance to the evil work that was done by the angels.

4,3 "But if it didn't assist in the work, and couldn't stop it even though it wanted to, there is a great deal of weakness in this power that wanted to prevent the work but couldn't. And the band of the angels that the power made must be more powerful than the power, even though it is the cause of the angels it made." In every respect, then, the sect's thesis is caught out, and incurs (a verdict of) untenability, not of truth.

4,4 "But if it knew, and yet it had to make these angels who <would> do something wrong against its will, it will find itself with one more fault." To hear Satornilus tell it, nothing in the power on high will turn out right.

4,5 But let's go on questioning him. "Hey you, tell us, since you squinted through a window—my way of making fun of your nonsense—and took a peek at the way the angels were created, and then saw <how they went about> making the clay figure of the man, and spied on the supreme power's industry! Did the angels know what they were going to create, or were they unaware of it? But if they were unaware of it, was anyone forcing them to finish the thing <they had done> in ignorance?"

"No," he says, "they were not unaware. They knew what they were going to do."

---

[21] 3.4-4,7 are the expansion of an argument which is stated at Iren. 2.5.3-4.

4,6 "Well, did the power on high know that they would undertake this, or was it unaware?"

"It was not unaware."

"Then did it, or didn't it, make them for the purpose of doing this?"

"No," he says, "it just made them, but they undertook to fashion a model against the wishes of the power on high."

4,7 "Then, you supreme fool, according to what you say the angels knew but it was unaware. And the preparation of men must be their origin, and the angels who are the causes of this are privy to it, but the power that made the angels is in ignorance! (8) But this would be foolish and absurd—that the work is more perfect than the workman, and the workman weaker than the angels he made, since they are the causes of the origin of man. Hence for every reason you must admit that <one has to> trace the universe to the same creator, the One, and to the one monarchy."

5,1 For in fact God the Father made man, and all things, of his own good pleasure—not the angels, nor has anything been made with the counsel of the angels. For in saying, "Let us make man," God said, "in *our* image," not merely "in *an* image."[22] (2) He was inviting his Word and Only-begotten into his act of creation as co-creator—as is the opinion, based on truth, of the faithful, and as is the exact truth. In many other works on the subject I have confessed, distinctly and at length, that the Father invited the Son, through whom he made all other things as well, to join him in making the man. (3) And I would say that he invited not only the Son, but the Holy Spirit as well: "By the Word of the Lord were the heavens established, and all the host of them by the Spirit of his mouth."[23] (4) Willingly or even unwillingly—I mean Satornilus, the founder of this sect—he will be forced for every reason to confess that God is one, God and Lord, creator and maker of all that is, along with man.

5,5 And he will be exposed as a slanderer for every reason, both in what he says about prophets, and his cheap accusation of lawful wedlock. Our Lord Jesus Christ himself makes an express pronouncement in the Gospel and says, in agreement with the prophet, "Lo here am I, that speak in the prophets"—and again, "My Father worketh hitherto, I too am at work".[24] (6) But to show which work his Father and he are doing, he declared it by saying to those who asked him if one may divorce a wife for every cause, "How is it written? When God made man, he made them male and female," and again, later in the passage, "For this cause shall a man leave his father

[22] Gen 1:26
[23] Ps. 32:6
[24] John 5:17

and his mother and cleave unto his wife, and they twain shall become one flesh"; and he added immediately, "That which *God* hath joined together, let not man put asunder.[25] Thus Savior teaches in every way that the God of all is the maker of men, and is his Father.

5,7 And as to marriage's not being of Satan, but of God, in the first place the Lord says, "That which God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."[26] Then the holy apostle: "Marriage is honorable and the bed undefiled."[27] And he gives a similar commandment to the true widows, and says through Timothy, "Younger widows refuse; for after they have waxed wanton against Christ, they will marry." And later, "Let them marry, bear children, guide the house"[28]—making a law which may not be transgressed, since it is from God and has been solemnly granted to men.

6,1 And there are any number of things to say about the unfounded suspicions he has raised against God's prophecies, as though they are not from God. As the Only-begotten himself says <when> he makes his proclamation that the world is his, first, "Our father Abraham desired to see my day, and he saw it, and was glad."[29] And again he says, "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me."[30]

6,2 And who is there, of sound mind and with God-given understanding, who can fail to show the cheat Satornilus up—knowing that, when the Savior was revealed in glory in support of the truth, he showed his glory in no other way than between Elijah and Moses, who themselves appeared with him in their own glory?

6,3 But there are any number of other things like these, said by the Lord himself and throughout the New Testament, which unite the Law, the prophets and the whole Old Testament with the New—since they are both Testaments of one God, as he says, "They shall come and recline on the bosoms of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, and shall find rest from the east and west,"[31] and so on. (4) And again, the prophecy concerning him which is given as David's, "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand."[32] And again, the words he himself says to the Pharisees, "Did ye never read, the stone which the builders

---

[25] Matt 19:6
[26] Matt 19:6
[27] Heb 13:4
[28] 1 Tim 5:11;14
[29] John 8:56
[30] John 5:46
[31] Matt 8:11
[32] Ps. 109:1

rejected?"[33] (5) And Luke affirms that the Savior himself appeared on the road to Nathanael and Cleopas after his resurrection from the dead, and admonished them from the psalms and the prophets that "Thus it behooved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day."[34] And there is no discrepancy whatever between Christ's incarnation and the oracles of the prophets.

7,1 But this will do for Satornilus' sect—not to waste time by becoming involved in his foolish disputations and the refutations of them. (2) Next, moving on from this one, I shall describe the sect of Basilides, Satornilus' fellow-student and companion in error. For these men share <the same material> as though they had borrowed their poison from each other, as in the familiar proverb of "an asp borrowing poison from a viper." For they each belong to the other's school and council, though each stands by himself as founder of his own sect. And they borrowed the wickedness from each other, but were the authors of the discrepancy between them.

7,3 So whether, like a viper, Satornilus got his venom from the ancients and has imparted it to Basilides, or whether Basilides imparted it to Satornilus, let us leave their poison behind us, deadly as it is, and coming from such serpents as these, (but) weakened and deprived of its strength with the Lord's teaching as with an antidote. Let us, however, call on God, beloved, and go on to the next.

24.

Against Basilides[1] *Number four, but twenty-four of the series*

1,1 Basilides then, as I have already explained, made his way to Egypt and spent some time there, then went to Prosopitis and Athribitis, and moreover, to the environs, or "nome," of Saites and Alexandria.[2] (2) For

---

[33] Matt. 21:42
[34] Luke 24:26

[1] The primary source of this Sect is Hipp. Synt., cf. PsT 1.5. However, Epiph also uses Irenaeus (1.24.3-7) and mentions him by name at 8,1. Fil. 32 may depend either upon Hipp. Synt. or upon Epiph.

The very long account of Basilides at Hipp. Refut. 7.23.7 is from a source unrelated to the ones mentioned, and contradicts them at some points. Eus. H. E. 4.7.3-7 describes Basilides from a source he identifies as Agrippa Castor. Clem. Strom. 7.17.106 says that Basilides claimed to have been taught by Paul's interpreter Glaucias. For a mention of "Basilideans" see Justin Dial. 35.6. The NHC tractate Test. Tr., as reconstructed by Giverson and Pearson mentions Basilides pejoratively at 57,6-8.

[2] Iren. 1.24.2: Alexandrii; Fil. 32.2 simply says Aegyptum.

the Egyptians call the neighborhood or environs of each city a "nome." You may find even this of use to you, scholarly reader, for love of learning and clarity's sake, as a pious confirmation and explanation of the points in sacred scripture that baffle some because of their inexperience. (3) Whenever you find a mention of "nomes" of Egyptian cities in the holy prophet Isaiah—such as the "nomes" of Tanis or Memphis, or the "nome" of Bubastis—it means the area around one city or another. And there, for love of learning's sake, you have the translation.

1,4 So this tramp spent his entire life in these places, the ones where his sect, which flourishes even today after having taken occasion from his teaching, appeared. (5) And he began to preach much more material than the charlatan who was his fellow-student, and was left in Syria—for the sake of seeming to to deceive his audience more completely, if you please, by telling them more than he had,[3] and of gratifying and gathering more of a crowd than his colleague, Satornilus. (6) Now then, to fob some of his fairy stories off on us he begins them as follows—though <to tell> the truth, he does not begin these shocking, deadly things from a notion of his own but by taking his cue from Satornilus, and from Simon whom we have already mentioned. He, though, wants to handle them differently, and give his mythology at greater length.

1,7[4] There was one Ingenerate, he says, who alone is the Father of all. From him Mind has been emitted, from Mind Reason, from Reason Prudence, from Prudence Power and Wisdom,[5] and from Power and Wisdom, principalities, authorities and angels. (8) From these powers and angels a highest first heaven has come, and other angels have come from them. And the angels who come from them have made a second heaven, and made angels themselves in their turn. (9) And the angels who come from them have made a third heaven. And so, by producing another heaven and other angels in turn, the angels of each heaven have brought the number of heavens to 365,[6] from the highest to this one above us.

---

[3] Cf. Iren. 1.24.3, Basilides, ut altius aliquid et verisimilius invenisse videtur, in immensum extendit sententiam doctrinae suae.

[4] With the paragraph which follows cf. PsT 1.5; Iren. 1.24.3; Fil. 32.2-3.

[5] These emanations are roughly paralleled by the archons Ogdoas and Hebomas and their sons, at Hipp. Refut. 7.23.1-24.7. However, no angels follow these, and at Refut. 7.22-23 Basilides is said to deny the idea of emanation as such.

[6] Forms of this teaching are found in NHC at Apocry. Jn. II,1 11,23-25; Eug. 84,1-85,4; Val. Exp. 30,29-38, and at Gos. Jud. 49,9-50,2. Cf. Hipp. Refut. 6.53.5; U 3 (MacDermot p. 230); 6 (p. 236); 9 (p. 240); 10 (p. 245); PS 3.132 (MacDermot p. 342).

2,1 For fools this might serve as a temptation to believe his crazy nonsense, but for the wise it is easy to refute his speech and his way of perverting his own opinion into extreme, unbounded mischief. (2) As though thunderstruck by some poetic frenzy, the pathetic excuse for a man assigns names to every archon in the heavens and, to the ruin of his dupes' souls, publishes them to win credence from the weak-minded through the names he makes up. What is more, the cheat never flagged in his devotion to conjuror's devices and mumbo-jumbo.[7]

2,3 He says that this creation was produced later by the angels of our heaven and the power in it. One of these angels he calls God and distinguishes him by saying that he alone is the God of the Jews—though he made him one of the number of the angels whose names he coined for us as though he were composing a mime.[8] By him the man was fashioned.[9]

2,4 The angels, including himself, have parceled the world out by lot to the multitude of the angels; but this God of the Jews has drawn the Jewish people.[10] And to insult this same almighty Lord who alone, and no other, is the true God—for we confess that it is he who is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ—Basilides, as I have shown, denies him and represents him as one of his so-called angels.

2,5 The Jews have fallen to his lot, and he defends them. But he is the most self-willed of all the angels, and he led the children of Israel out of Egypt by the self-will of his own arm,[11] since he was more reckless and self-willed than the others. (6) Hence this God of theirs has plotted—because of his willfulness, the charlatan blasphemously says—to subject all the other nations to the stock of Israel, and has launched wars for this purpose.

2,6 Altogether pathetic himself though he is, he does not hesitate to give free rein to his tongue, speak up, and say many other things against the holy God. (7) He says it is for this reason that the other nations made war on this one and inflicted many evils on it, because of the other angels' jealousy. Provoked, since they felt despised by the God of the Jews—they

---

[7] Irenaeus accuses Basilideans of employing magic at 1.24.5.

[8] Iren. 1.24.5; Fil. 32.4. At PsT 1.5 this angel is called novissimum.

[9] Cf. Iren. 1.24.4; PsT 1.5.

[10] PsT 1.5: huic sortito obtigisse semen Abrahae. Cf. Iren. 1.24.4; Fil. 32.4.

[11] Iren. 1.24.4; PsT 1.5; Fil. 32.5-6. αὐθαδείᾳ is a play on βραχίονι ὑψηλῷ at Exod 6:6. Neither Iren. nor PsT reports the term αὐθάδης, Fil. may have taken it from Epiph. In NHC this term, or αὐθάδεια, appears in connection with the wicked archon at Apocry. Jn. II,1 13,26-28; Let. Pet. 135,16-22; 136,5. Cf. PS 1.29 (MacDermot p. 42); 1.30 (MacDermot p. 44).

stirred their own nations up against the nation of Israel, which was under his command.[12] And this is why wars and disorders constantly broke out against them.

3,1 This is the fraud's specious argument. He too, likewise, believes that Christ was manifest (only) in appearance. He says that since he "appears," he is an "appearance"; but he is not man and has not taken flesh.[13]

3,2 This second mimologue[14] mounts another dramatic piece for us in his account of the cross of Christ; for he claims that not Jesus, but Simon of Cyrene, has suffered. For when the Lord was marched out of Jerusalem, as the Gospel passage says, one Simon of Cyrene was compelled to bear the cross. (3) From this he finds his trickery's <opportunity> for composing his dramatic piece and says: Jesus changed Simon into his own form while he was bearing the cross, and changed himself into Simon, and delivered Simon to crucifixion in his place. (4) During Simon's crucifixion Jesus stood opposite him unseen, laughing[15] at the persons who were crucifying Simon. But he himself flew off to the heavenly realms after delivering Simon to crucifixion, and returned to heaven without suffering. (5) It was Simon himself who was crucified, not Jesus. Jesus, Basilides says, passed through all the powers on his flight to heaven, till he was restored to his own Father.[16] (6) For he is the Father's Son of whom we have spoken, sent to men's aid because of the disorder that the Father saw both in men and in angels.[17] And he is our salvation, he says, who came and revealed this truth to us alone.

---

[12] At Tri. Trac. 100,3-4 in NHC, each archon has his own γένος and ἄξια though Israel is not mentioned. The archons and their nations war on Israel at Iren. 1.24.4; PsT 1.5; Fil. 32.

[13] PsT 1.5; Fil. 32.6. Iren. 1.24.6 says that Christ "appeared" (apparuisse), and also identifies him with Nous.

[14] The "first" μιμόλογος is Satornilus. There is no covert allusion here to CG VII,3, The Second Logos of the Great Seth; on the subject see also Pourkier. When Epiph makes humorous allusions, he typically lays heavy emphasis upon them rather than inserting them in passing.

[15] Cf. Apoc. Pet. 81,7-21; 82,4-16.

[16] Iren. 1.24.4; PsT 1.5; Fil. 32.6. In NHC, Gr. Seth 55,15-56,11 has been but should probably not be interpreted as the same story. Various quasi-docetic views of the crucifixion appear in NHC at 1 Apoc. Jas. 31,14-22; perhaps Apoc. Adam 77,9-18; Apoc. Pet. 81,6-83,15; perhaps Let. Pet. 139,15-25 and Cod. Tch. Let. Pet. 8,1-5. See also Acts of John 97-99; 101; 102 (H-S II pp. 184-186). The reality of the crucifixion is insisted on at Melch. 5,7-8. At Hipp. Refut. 7.26.13 Basilides himself is said to teach that it is real.

[17] Iren. 1.24.4 . . . Patrem, videntem perditionem ipsorum . . . Irenaeus goes on to say that Christ came to free humanity from the power of those who made the world. At NHC's Tri. Trac. At 80,4-19 and 83,34-84,24 the creatures of the Demiurge quarrel.

3,7 Such are the recitals of the tramp's mythology. And at this point, moreover—since the uncleanness which began with Simon is making strides—Basilides gives his disciples permission to perform the whole of every kind of badness and licentiousness, and gives his converts full instruction in the promiscuous intercourse of an evil kind between men and women.[18] (8) Of them and their kind the apostle says, "The wrath and righteous judgment of God is revealed against those who hold the truth in unrighteousness."[19] For many fall into the heresy for this reason of self-indulgence, since through these unnatural acts they find a way of doing their pleasure with impunity.

4,1 Again, he gives a permissive sort of teaching by alleging that there is no need to be a martyr.[20] There will be no reward for a martyr, since he is not bearing witness to man's creator; he is testifying for the crucified, Simon. (2) Now, how can he have a reward when he dies for Simon, the one who was crucified, while avowing that he is doing this for a Christ whom he knows nothing about, dying for someone he does not know he is dying for? One must deny then, and not die rashly.[21]

5,1 But this man will be apprehended as heading a host of devils against souls by teaching them the denial of God, since the Lord himself says, "Whosoever denieth me before men, him will I deny before my Father which is in heaven."[22] (2) But the tramp says, "We are the 'men.'[23] The others are all swine and dogs. And this is why he said, 'Cast not thy pearls before swine, neither give that which is holy unto dogs.'"[24] (3) For Basilides hides his own wickedness from people with sense, but discloses it to his own coterie and the ones he has duped. Because it is indeed a "shame even to speak"[25] of the things they say and do, he says that one must confess the truth "before 'men'—for we are the 'men', but the others are swine and dogs," as I said.

---

[18] Epiph deduces this from the universae libidinis of Iren. 1.24.5; cf. Fil. 32.7. Basilideans are accused of immorality at Clem. Alex. Strom. 3.1.

[19] Rom 1:18

[20] Iren. 1.24.4; Fil. 32.7-8; Eus. H. E. 4.7.7; Orig. Com. in Matt. 24:7-8 Ser. 38 (Klostermann p. 73). In NHC martyrdom is deprecated at Test. Tr. 33,24-34 and perhaps at Gr. Seth 49,26-27, but is strongly recommended at Apocry. Jas. 5,9-6,20.

[21] Clem. Strom. 4.1.81.1f quotes Basilides as teaching that the martyr's death is really a punishment for previous sins.

[22] Matt. 10:33

[23] Cf. Gos. Phil. 80,23-81,4. Pourkier suggests that the quotation is in fact an inference drawn by Epiph himself.

[24] Matt 7:6

[25] Eph. 5:12

5,4 Basilides claims that <they may> not reveal anything at all to anyone about the Father, and about his own mystery, but <must> keep it secret within themselves[26] and reveal it to one out of thousands and two out of ten thousands.[27] He cautions his disciples by saying, "Know all men yourself, but let no man know you."[28] (5) When questioned, he and his followers claim that they are no longer Jews and have not yet become Christians, but that they always deny, keep the faith secret within themselves, and tell it to no one—anticipating his own shame because of the unspeakable nature of his obscenity and bad doctrine.

6,1 The beginning of his wicked pretense had its cause in searching for the origin of evil[29] and saying what it was. But what every person is like will be shown by his business. Hence these people who love evil and not good are merchants of evil, as the scripture said: "They that seek mischief, it shall come unto them."[30] (2) There never was such a thing as "evil," there has never been a "root of evil," and "evil" is not a thing. At one time evil did not exist, but in anyone who does it, it exists as something that has been imported into him, by reason (of his doing it). In one who does not do it it does not exist, as explained above. (3) For after he has made all things the Lord says, "Behold, all things are very good,"[31] proving that evil is not primordial, and did not exist at the beginning before it was begun by men. Through us it comes into being, and through us it does not. (4) Therefore, since everyone has the ability not to do evil and the ability to do it, evil exists when he does it but is non-existent when he does not. So what becomes of the "root of evil," or the substance of wickedness?

7,1 Basilides has arrived at a point of great folly by claining that the power <on high> emitted Mind, that Mind emitted Reason, Reason emitted Prudence, Prudence emitted Power and Wisdom, and that authorities, powers and angels spring from Power and Wisdom. (2) Yet (over and above that) he says that the power and first principle above these is Abrasax,[32]

---

[26] Iren. 1.24.6. Similar directions appear in NHC at Apocry. Jn. II,1 31,29-37; 1 Apoc. Jas. 36,13-16 and Cod. Tch. James 23,10-16. Cf. Corp. Herm. 13.116; Ascl. 32 (Nock-Festugière p. 341) and, in the Qumran material at 1QS 9,16-18 (Wise et al., p. 139).

[27] Iren. 1.24.6 unum a mille et due a myriadibus. Versions of this saying are found in NHC at GT 23, and in other literature at PS 3.134 (MacDermot p. 350).

[28] Iren. 1.24.6

[29] Contrast Apoc. Peter 77,23-32: Others . . . will set up their error and their law against these pure thoughts of mine . . . thinking that good and evil are from one (source).

[30] Prov 11:27

[31] Gen 1:31

[32] At Iren. 1.24.7 Abrasax is princeps of the 365 heavens, and at Hipp. Refut. 7.26.6 τὸν μέγαν ἄρχοντα αὐτῶν. PsT 1.5 makes Abrasax simply the Basilidean name for God: hunc esse dicit summum deum. At NHC Gosp. Egyp. III,2 52,26

because the sum of the letters of Abrasax is 365—so that from this he tries to establish the evidence for his myth of the 365 heavens. (3) He even maps out the locations of these heavens with great care, by his practice of dividing and combining them like the mathematicians.[33] For he and his subordinates have taken their futile speculations and applied them to their own type (of speculation), for the sake of their own delusive, false teaching.

7,4 And they would like to give proof of these things from figures that are similar to them—since "Abrasax" makes 365, as I said—and prove, if you please, that this is why a year has 365 days per cycle.[34] (5) But his silly argument is a failure; a year, in fact, consists of 365 days and three hours. (6) Then, he says, man also has 365 members for this reason, so that he can assign one member to each of the powers.[35] His contrived, spurious teaching fails in this as well; there are 364 members in a man.

8,1 But the blessed Irenaeus, the successor of the apostles, has gone into detail about him and given a marvelous refutation of his stupidity. (2) Now too there will be a refutation for the nonsense of this Basilides, who has come down from on high after taking a good look at what is up there—or rather, who has fallen down, wide of the mark of the truth. (3) For if this heaven has been made by its angels, and they by the higher ones and the higher ones by ones higher still, then the power on high, also called Abrasax, will have to be the one which has made everything, and the cause of all that is. And nothing can have been made apart from it (4) since they declare it to be the cause and first archetype, and their so-called "deficiency"[36] of this world can have been produced by nothing other than the first principle and cause of the things that came later.

8,5 But we need to ask him, "Why take us to such a bunch, Mister, and not rather to the first principle—that is, to the one God, the Almighty?"—since by all accounts he either means this or, on his premises, ought to confess the one Cause of all as Master.

Abrasax is the minister of the great light Eleleth; he is Eleleth's eternal life at 53,91 and one of the four lights at 65,1; he is an angelic or aeonic being at Apoc. Adam 75,17-27; 78,9-11; Zost. 47,11. The name is common on Graeco-Roman amulets, see Preisendanz *Papyri Graeci Magici* 3, and can be given to Hermes, the creator, See the material in Dietrich, *Abraxas.*

[33] Iren. 1.24.7

[34] Iren. 1.24.3; Hipp. Refut. 8.26.6; Jer. In Amos 3:10 (Adriaen p. 451)

[35] At NHC's Apocry. Jn. II,1 19,2-3 it is said that the 365 "angels" who have just been mentioned create, or rule over the members of the body; at PS 3.132 (MacDermot p. 342) 365 "leitourgoi" fulfill this function.

[36] See p. 170 n. 9.

8,6 "And moreover, you composer of this work of fiction, give us an answer on the subject of Christ! If Simon of Cyrene was crucified, then our salvation has not been secured by Jesus but by Simon, and the world can no longer hope to be saved through Jesus Christ, who did not suffer for us. For Simon cannot save us either; he is a man and nothing but. (7) And at the same time you are also accusing God's only-begotten Son of false prosecution, if the good God delivered someone else by force to be murdered in his place. (8) And for the rest, something like this must be a dream or rather, must be a work of malignity and trickery—that <the> Lord concealed himself by some trickery or other and delivered someone else in his place. And your foolish chatter amounts to a false prosecution of the truth, a prosecution that cannot succeed but stands convicted by the truth itself of introducing fiction without proof."

9,1 For the truth altogether refutes this heresiarch in the Old and New Testaments. Anyone can see that Christ went to his passion freely, and that he took flesh and became man among us by his own will and his Father's, with the Holy Spirit's consent. This though he was perfect God from the first, (2) begotten of the Father without beginning and not in time. But in the last days he consented to enter a Virgin's womb, formed flesh for himself, was truly born and assuredly made man, to suffer for us in the flesh itself, and give his life for his own sheep. (3) And so he refutes these people by saying, "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and the Son of Man shall be delivered up and put to death, and the third day he shall rise again."[37] And to the sons of Zebedee he said, "Are ye able to drink the cup that I shall drink of'?[38]—(4) as the apostle Peter also says, "being put to death in the flesh but quickened by the Spirit,"[39] and again, "who suffered for us in the flesh."[40] (5) And again, John says, "Whoso denieth that Christ is come in the flesh, the same is Antichrist."[41] And St. Paul says, "having tasted of death, even the death of the cross"[42]—as Moses also foretold, "Ye shall see your life hanging on a tree."[43] (6) And Simon is not our life, but the Lord who suffered for us to put an end to our sufferings; and who, by dying in the flesh, has become the death of death to break the sting of death, descending to the underworld to shatter the unbreakable bars. And having done this he led the host of captive souls to the heavens, and emptied Hades.

---

[37] Matt 20:18-19
[38] Matt 20:22
[39] 1 Pet 3:18
[40] 1 Pet 4:1
[41] Cf. 1 John 4:2-3.
[42] Phil 28
[43] Cf. Deut 28:66

10,1 Christ was not responsible for Simon's death, he surrendered himself! What do you mean, you craziest man in the world? If he didn't want to be crucified, couldn't he have said so frankly and gone away from them? Would the <Son> of God, the divine Word, lay a treacherous snare and hand someone else over to death by crucifixion in his place—the One who said, "I am the truth?" For he says, "I am the truth and the life."[44] The life would not engineer a death for someone else, nor would the truth conceal what it was truly doing and misrepresent it. Truth cannot be truth if it practices imposture and conceals its own act, but works through an artifice which is the opposite of it.

10,4 And to say it all in a word so as not to prolong the discussion, "Woe to the world because of offenses" and "them that work iniquity!"[45] How many have turned out to be darkness for themselves, and darkness for the others after them who trust in their darkness! But to the wise the truth will be made clear, but the business of Basilides and his kind be exposed as a work of imposture.

10,5 And so much for this sect, and this myth; I shall go on from here to another heresy. (6) For who can fail to realize that this sort of heresy is a myth and, like a horned asp, lies buried in sand, but pokes up into the air with its horn, and inflicts death on those who happen upon it? (7) However, "The Lord hath broken the horn of sinners, and the horn of the righteous alone"—which means trust in truth—"shall be exalted."[46] (8) Therefore, since we have broken Basilides too with the doctrine of the truth, let us go on to the sects following, calling as our help on God to whom be glory, honor and worship, forever and ever. Amen.

25.

Against Nicolaitans,[1] *number five, but twenty-five of the series*

1,1 Nicolaus was one of the seven deacons chosen by the apostles, together with the saint and first martyr Stephen, and Prochorus, Parmenas and the

[44] John 14:6
[45] Matt 18:7 and 7:23
[46] Ps 74:11

[1] This Sect's points of contact with PsT 1.6 and Fil. 33 suggest that one of its sources is Hipp. Synt. However, Epiph supplies many details from Irenaeus' reports of Gnostic teachings, in the conviction that Nicolaus is the father of the Gnostics (cf. Hipp. Refut. 7.36.3 Γνωστικῶν <μὲν> δὴ διαφοραὶ <αἱ> γνῶμαι…πολλῆς δὲ αὐτοῖς συστάσεως αἴτιος γεγένηται Νικόλαος…and cf. Fil. 33.2). Iren. 1.26.3 and Hipp. Refut. 7.26.2-3 are based on Acts and Revelation. Fil. 33 is dependent upon Hipp. Synt. but might also draw on Epiph.

others. (2) He was from Antioch and became a proselyte. But after that he received the message of the proclamation of Christ, joined the disciples himself, and <was> at first ranked among the foremost. He was thus included among the ones who were chosen at the time to care for the widows.[2] (3) Later, however, the devil slipped into him and deceived his heart with the same imposture of the ancients whom we have been discussing, so that he was more severely wounded than the ones before him.

1,4 Though he had a beautiful wife he had refrained from intercourse with her, as though in emulation of those whom he saw devoting themselves to God.[3] He persevered for a while but could not bear to control his incontinence till the end. Instead, desiring to return like a dog to its vomit, he kept looking for poor excuses and inventing them in defense of his own intemperate passion. (<Being ashamed and repenting> would have done him more good!) Then, failing of his purpose, he simply began having sex with his wife. (5) But because he was ashamed of his defeat and suspected that he had been found out, he ventured to say, "Unless one copulates every day, he has no part in eternal life."[4] (1,6) For he had shifted from one pretense to another.

Seeing that his wife was unusually beautiful and yet bore herself with modesty, he envied her. And, supposing that everyone was as lascivious as he, he began by constantly being offensive to his wife and making certain slanderous charges against her in speeches.[5] And at length he degraded himself not only to normal sexual activity but to a blasphemous opinion, the harm of perverse teaching, and the deceit of the covert introduction of wickedness.

2,1 And from this source the <founders> of what is falsely termed "'Knowledge" began their evil sprouting in the world[6]—I mean the people

---

This Sect also incorporates Epiph's interpretation of the story of Nicolaus' fall as told at Clem. Alex. Strom. 3.4.25.5-26.3/Eus. H. E. 3.24.2-4. Epiph agrees with the other heresiologists in considering Nicolaus the main source of Gnostic immorality, as Rev 2:14-15 would have suggested to them.

[2] Acts 6:1-6. The same passage is used at Iren. 1.26.3; PsT l.6; Fil. 33.1.

[3] At Clem. Alex. Strom. 3.4.25.5-26.3/Eus. H. E. 3.29.2 this story is intended to display Nicolaus' chastity. Epiph has interpreted it in accordance with his convictions about Nicolaus and the Nicolaitans. With "as though from envy" etc., cf. Clement's πρὸς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὀνειδισθὲν ζηλοτυπίαν.

[4] Epiph interprets the quotation made at Clem. Alex. Strom. 3.4.26.6/Eus. H. E. 3.29.2 παραχρήσασθαι τῇ σαρκὶ δεῖ, as "one must misuse the flesh." Clement, however, meant "deny, discipline" the flesh, and interprets Nicolaus' act as intended to teach ἐγκράτεια.

[5] Clem. Strom. 3.4.26.6/Eus. H. E. 3.29.2: εἰς μέσον ἀγαγὼν τὴν γυναῖκα γῆμαι τῷ βουλμένῳ ἐπέτρεψεν.

[6] See Hipp. Refut. 7.36.3; Fil 33.1.

who are called Gnostics and Phibionites, the so-called disciples of Epiphanes, the Stratiotics, Levitics, Borborites and the rest. For each of these, in attracting his own sect with his own passions, invented countless ways of doing evil.

2,2 For some of them glorify a Barbelo[7] who they claim is on high in an eighth heaven,[8] and say she has been emitted by the Father. For some of them say she is the mother of Ialdabaoth,[9] others, of Sabaoth.[10] (3) But her son has ruled the seventh heaven with a sort of insolence, and tyrannically. To the ones below him he says, "I am the first and I am the last, and there is none other God beside me."[11] (4) But Barbelo has heard what he says, and weeps.[12] And she keeps appearing in some beautiful form to the archons and stealing the seed which is generated by their climax and ejaculation—supposedly to recover her power[13] which has been sown in various of them.

2,5 And so, on such a basis as this, he covertly brought his smutty mystery to the world. And as I said, some of the others too, with much turpitude, taught the practice—it is not right to say how they did it—of promiscuity with women and unnatural acts of intolerable perversity as the most holy apostle somewhere says, "It is a shame even to speak of the things that are done of them in secret."[14] (3,1) But if anyone would like to

---

[7] For Barbelo see Iren. 1.29.1; Fil. 33.2. In the Sethian tractates of NHC, Barbelo is regularly God's first emanation, the aeon of thought, and the source (sometimes the "mother") of the other aeons. See especially Apocry. Jn. II,1 4,26-5,11; in other tractates, Gos. Egyp. (III,2)42,11-12; 61.25-62,1; 69,3; Stel. Seth 121,20-25; Zost. 14,3-6; 53,10; 62,21; 119,23; 129,11; Melch. 5,27; 16,25-26; Mars. 4,11-12; 8,28-29; Allog. 51,12-17; 53,21-28; 59;1-9; Tri. Prot. 38,7-10; also, Gos. Judas 35,18.

[8] For the Mother in the eighth heaven, see Iren. 1.30.4.

[9] Iren. 1.30.5; Fil 33.3. In NHC the ignorant or wicked creator/ruler of the material universe is often named Ialdabaoth. See Apocry. Jn. 10,19;11,16; 35; 14;15; 19,23; 23,35-37; 24,12; Nat. Arc.95,5-13; 96,3-5; Orig. Wld. 100,1-26; 102,11-23; 103,1; SJC BG,3 119,14-15; Tri. Prot. 39,26-28. Cf. also Gos. Jud. 51,15. Ialdabaoth may originally have been a Jewish euphemism for JHVH Sabaoth; note that in the Hebrew alphabet, ד is one place removed from ה.

[10] At Iren. 1.30.5 Sabaoth is the son of Iao. In the Sethian documents of NHC he is the son or creature of Ialdabaoth, never of Barbelo. For Sabaoth see Apocry. Jn. 9,25-10,19; Nat. Arc. 95,5-25; Or. Wld. 103,32-104,10;106,19-26; 113,12; 114,15-17; Gos. Egyp. 58,14-15.

[11] Iren. 1.30.6. This interpretation of Isa 44:6 or 45:5 is common in NHC and Gnostic literature. In NHC see Apocry. Jn. II,1 11,18-22; Nat. Arc. 86,27-32; 94,19-23; Or. World 103,1-13; Gos. Egyp. III,2 58,23-59,1; 2 Apoc. Jas 56,23-57,1; Tri. Prot. 43,31-44,2, and for comparable ideas: Tri. Trac. 79,12-19; 84,3-6; 100,36-101,5; SJC 106,24-107,11; 1 Apoc. Jas. 35,13-17; Para. Shem 2.15-17.

[12] Sophia weeps at the results of her activity at Apocry. Jn. II,1 13,30-14,1.

[13] See p. 65 n. 18.

[14] Eph 5:12

see the Holy Spirit's rebuttal in the case of Nicolaus' sect, he must learn it from the Revelation of St. John. John writes in the Lord's name to one of the churches—that is, to the bishop appointed there with the power of the holy angel at the altar—and says, "One good thing thou hast, that thou hatest the deeds of the Nicolaitans, which I also hate."[15]

3,2 But others honor one "Prunicus"[16] and like these, when they consummate their own passions with this kind of disgusting behavior, they say in mythological language of this interpretation of their disgusting behavior, "We are gathering the power of Prunicus from our bodies, and through their emissions." That is, <they suppose they are gathering> the power of semen and menses. (3) A little later, whenever I undertake to speak of them by themselves, I shall describe them in detail—not to sully the ears of the listeners or readers, but to arouse enmity against these persons in the wise, and prevent the doing of their evil deeds. I shall not be accusing the guilty parties falsely, but truthfully making public the things that go on among them.

3,4 Others glorify the Ialdabaoth we spoke of and claim, as I said, that he is Barbelo's eldest son. And they say he is to be honored because he has revealed many things. (5) And so they fabricate certain books in Ialdabaoth's name and make up any number of outlandish names for archons—<as> they say—and authorities, which oppose the human soul in every heaven.[17] And in a word, the plot which is hatched against mankind by their imposture is a serious one.

3,6 Others likewise glorify Kaulakau,[18] giving this name to an archon, and do their best to impress the innocent with the frightfulness of this artificial name's barbarity. But to those who are experienced and have received grace from God about every name and subject of God's true knowledge, how can the <un>warranted teachings of their myth and imposture not be refutable at once?

---

[15] Rev. 2:6. Cf. PsT 1.6.

[16] For Prunicus see Iren. 1.29.4, and also 1.30.3; 7; 9; 11-12, where she plays the role of the fallen Sophia. In 7 and 9 she is the benefactress of Adam and Eve; in 11-12 she assists Elizabeth and Mary and is united with the Christ who descends from heaven. In Origen's discussion of the Ophites at Cels. 6.34.1 she is "a virgin and living soul"; at 6.35.2 a "kind of wisdom." For Prunicus in NHC, see Apocry. Jn. BG2: 51,4; Thunder 13,18; 19; Gr. Seth 50, 25-28. Macrae at Thunder 13,18 and Bullard and Gibbons at Gr. Seth 50,28 translate Prunicus as "whore."

[17] This is reported of Basilides at Iren. 1.24.5.

[18] Cf. Fil. 33.3. This is the Basilidean name for Christ at Iren. 1.24.6; at Hipp. Refut. 5.8.4 it is the Ophites' heavenly Adamas.

4,1 For if they say, "Prunicus," this is just a belch of lustfulness and incontinence. Anything called "prunicus" suggests a thing named for copulation, and the enterprise of seduction. (2) For there is a Greek expression which is used of men who deflower slave women, "He seduced so-and-so." And the Greek swindlers who compose erotica also record the word in myths by saying that beauty is "seductive."

4,3 Furthermore, how can any knowledgeable person not laugh at Kaulakau? To plant their imposture in the simple by means of something imaginary, they turn the good Hebrew words, correctly rendered in Greek, <still> clear to those who read Hebrew, and containing nothing obscure, into images, shapes, real principles, practically statuary, for the sowing of their shameful art with its fictitious basis. (4) "Kaulakau," is in Isaiah, and is an expression in the twelfth vision, where he says, "Await tribulation upon tribulation, hope upon hope, a little more a little more."[19] (5) I am going to give the Hebrew words themselves here in full, word for word as they are written. "Tsav l'tsav, tsav l'tsav," means "tribulation upon tribulation." "Qav l'qav, qav l'qav" means "hope upon hope." "Z'eir sham, z'eir sham" means, "Await a little more a little more."

4,6 Where does this leave their mythology? How did they conceive their fantasy? How did the world get these tares? Who forced men to draw destruction upon themselves? (7) For if they knowingly changed the terms into an illusion, they are obviously responsible for their own ruin. But if they ignorantly said things that they did not know, there is nothing more pathetic than they. For these things are really foolish, <as> anyone with God-inspired understanding can see. (8) For the sake of their lustfulness they have destroyed, and are destroying, both themselves and whomever they can convince.

4,9 For there is a spirit of imposture which, like breath in a flute, sets every fool in motion against the truth with its various movements. Indeed, the flute itself is a replica of the serpent through which the evil one spoke and deceived Eve. (10) For the flute was prepared to deceive mankind, on its model and in imitation of it. And see what the flutist himself represents as he plays his flute; he throws his head back as he plays and bends it forward, he leans right and leans left like the serpent. (11) For the devil makes these gestures too, to display blasphemy of the heavenly host and to destroy earth's creatures utterly while at the same time getting the world into his toils, wreaking havoc right and left on those who trust the imposture, and are charmed by it as by the notes of an instrument.

[19] Isa 28:10

5,1[20] Certain others of them make up some new names, and say that there were Darkness, Depth and Water, and that the Spirit in between them formed their boundary.[21] But Darkness was angry and enraged at Spirit, and this Darkness sprang up, embraced it,[22] they say, and sired something called "Womb."[23] After Womb was born it conceived by Spirit itself. (2) A certain four aeons were emitted from Womb,[24] but fourteen others from the four, and this was the origin of "right" and "left,"[25] darkness and light. (3) But later, after all these, a certain ignoble aeon was emitted. It had intercourse with the Womb we mentioned above, and by this ignoble aeon and Womb gods, angels, demons and seven spirits were produced. (4) But it is easy to detect the cheap mime of their imposture. They have given it away by saying first that there is one "Father," and later designating many gods—to prove that error itself arms its falsehoods against itself and destroys itself, while the truth always proves <consistent> at every point.

6,1 Well, what should I say to you, Nicolaus? Which arguments shall I use? Where have you come from, you, to bring us an ignoble aeon, a root of wickedness, a fertile Womb, and a whole lot of gods and demons? (2) When the apostle says, "Though there be so-called gods,"[26] he is implying that there are no such things. By the words, "so-called," he showed that they are gods in name only—not existent in actuality, but in the opinion of certain people. (3) "But to us," he says, obviously meaning, "to us who are acquainted with the knowledge of the truth," "there is one God."[27] And he did not say, "so-called god," but actual "God." And if there is one God for us, there cannot be many gods.

6,4 And the Lord in the Gospel says, "that they might know thee, the only true God,"[28] to refute the notion of those who talk mythology and believe in polytheism. For our God is one—Father, Son and Holy Spirit, three subsistences, one Lordship, one Godhead, one Praise—and not many gods.

---

[20] Versions of this paragraph appear at PsT 1.6 and Fil. 33.4-5.

[21] This is an interpretation of Gen 1:1. Cf. NHC's Dia. Sav. 127,22-128,1; Para. Shem 1,25-28. With the entire paragraph cf. PsT 1.6.

[22] Cf. Para. Shem 4,27-30.

[23] Cf. At Iren. 1.31.2 we find Hysteran fabricatorem caeli et terrae vocant. 3,30-4,26 gives an account of the origin of Womb. In NHC an hypostatized Womb is not common outside of Para. Shem but see perhaps Int. Know. 3,26-32.

[24] Cf. Para. Shem 5,6-27.

[25] "Light and darkness, life and death, right and left" Gos. Phil. 53,14-15; "My remaining garments, those on the right and those on the left" Para. Shem 39,12-14

[26] 1 Cor 8:5

[27] 1 Cor 8:6

[28] John 17:2

6,5 And on your terms, Nicolaus, where is the application of the Savior's saying, "There are some eunuchs which were made eunuchs of men, and there are some which were eunuchs from birth, and there be eunuchs which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake?"[29] (6) If there are eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake, why have you deceived yourself and those who trust you, by holding God's truth in unrighteousness with your copulation and unnatural vice, and teaching <licentiousness>?

6,7 And where do you see the application of, "Concerning virgins I have no commandment of the Lord; but I give my judgment, as one that hath attained mercy, that it is good so to be"?[30] And again, "The virgin careth for the things of the Lord, how she may please the Lord, that she may be holy in body and in spirit."[31] (8) And how much there is to say about purity, continence and celibacy—for the whole filth of uncleanness is brazenly spelled out by yourself! But with these two or three texts <which I put before> the reader in refutation of the absurd sect, my purpose is served here.

7,1 But next I shall go on and describe the sect which is closely associated with Nicolaus, like a wood overgrown with grass, a thicket of thorns tangled together in every direction, or a heap of dead trees and scrub in a field, ready for burning—because of <its union> with this sect of the wretched Nicolaus. (2) <For> as bodies contract infection from other bodies through inoculation, a malignant itch, or leprosy, so the so-called <Gnostics> are partly united with <the Nicolaitans>, since they took their cues from Nicolaus himself and his predecessors—I mean Simon and the others. They are called "knowledgeable," but they are[32] known all too well for the wickedness and obscenity in the transactions of their unclean trade.

7,3 For with the reed that was placed in Christ's hand we have truly struck and destroyed this man as well, who practiced continence for a short while and then abandoned it—like the creature called the newt, which comes from the water to land and returns to the water again. Let us move on to the sects which follow.

---

[29] John 17:3
[30] Cf. 1 Cor 7:25-26.
[31] Cf. 1 Cor 7:32; 34.
[32] Epiph plays on Γνώστικοι and κατάγνωστοι

26.

Against Gnostics, or Borborites,[1] *Number six, but twenty-six of the series*

1,1 In turn these Gnostics have sprouted up in the world, deluded people who have grown from Nicolaus like fruit from a dunghill,[2] in a different way—something that is plain and observable to anyone by the touchstone of truth, not only to believers I should say, but perhaps to unbelievers too. For how can speaking of a "Womb" and dirt and the rest not appear ridiculous to everyone, "Greeks and barbarians, wise and unwise?"[3] (2) It is a great misfortune, and one might say the worst of hardships, that these despicable, erring founders of the sects come at us and assault us like a swarm of insects, infecting us with diseases, smelly eruptions, and sores through their error with its mythology.

1,3 These people, who are yoked in tandem with this Nicolaus and have been hatched by him in their turn like scorpions from an infertile snake's egg or <basilisks> from asps, introduce some further nonsensical names to us and forge nonsensical books. They call one Noria,[4] and interweave falsehood and truth by changing the mythological rigmarole and fiction of the Greeks from the Greek superstition's real meaning. (4) For they say that this Noria is Noah's wife.[5] But they call her Noria in order to create an illusion for their dupes by making their own alteration, with foreign names, of the things the Greeks recited in Greek, so that they too will translate Pyrrha's name by calling her Noria. (5) Now since "*nura*" means "fire" in Syriac, not ancient Hebrew—the ancient Hebrew for "fire" is "esh"—it follows that they are making an ignorant, naive use of this name.[6]

---

[1] The organization of this material is Epiphanius' own. He has certainly drawn on Hipp. Synt. and on Gnostic works (see 17,8). He mentions at least eight of these by name, (see 1,3; 2,5;6; 8,1 and 11,12) though he may not have read all of them. However, he quotes from a Questions of Mary, a Gospel of Philip, and a Birth of Mary and is especially dependent upon the first (see Tardieu, and also Dummer, "Angaben"). He also reports his own experience in Egypt, with a group which called themselves Gnostics, see 17,4-18,4. His placement of the "Gnostics" here, in association with the Nicolaitans might be due to his reading of Irenaeus, see n. 2 below.

[2] Cf. Iren. 1.28.2 Alii autem rursus a Basilide et Carpocrate occasiones accipientes, indifferentes coitus et multas nuptias induxerunt et neglegentiam ipsorum quae sunt idolothyta ad manducandum, non valde haec curare dicentes Deum. Cf. Pourkier p. 103.

[3] Rom 1:14

[4] CG IX,2 is entitled The Thought of Norea. Or. Wld. 102,10-22 refers to a first Book of Noraia, and 102,24-25 to a first Account of Oraia.

[5] Cf. Fil. 33.2. Norea or Orea is Seth's sister and, as it were, represents the ideal Gnostic at Nat. Arc. 91,34-92,3; 92,19-93,13. She is Seth's sister and wife at Iren. 1.30.9. In the Mandaean *Ginza* she is Noah's wife at 46,4-5, Dinanukht's at 211,36; 39.

[6] Epiph apparently connects Norea with nura, fire, because of the burning of the ark, see below at 1,8.

(6) Noah's wife was neither the Greeks' Pyrrha nor the Gnostics' mythical Noria, but Barthenos.[7] (And indeed, the Greeks say that Deucalion's wife was called Pyrrha.)

1,7 Then these people who are presenting us with Philistion's mimes all over again give a reason why Noria was not allowed to join Noah in the ark, though she often wanted to. The archon who made the world,[8] they say, wanted to destroy her in the flood with all the rest. (8) But they say that she sat down in the ark and burned it[9] a first and a second time, and a third. And this is why the building of Noah's own ark took many years[10]—it was burned many times by Noria.

1,9 For Noah was obedient to the archon,[11] they say, but Noria revealed the powers on high and Barbelo[12] the scion of the powers, who was the archon's opponent as the other powers are. And she let it be known that what has been stolen from the Mother on high by the archon who made the world, and by the other gods, demons and angels with him, must be gathered from the power in bodies, through the male and female emissions. (2,1) It is just my miserable luck to be telling you of all the blindness of their ignorance. For it would take me a great deal of time if I should wish go into detail here in the treatise I am writing about them and describe one by one the outrageous teachings of their falsely termed "knowledge".

2,2 Others of them, who in their turn are differently afflicted, and blind their own eyes and (so) are blinded, introduce a Barkabbas[13] as another prophet—one worthy of just that name! (3) "Qabba" means "fornication" in Syriac but "murder" in Hebrew—and again, it can be translated as "a quarter of a measure." And to persons who know this name in their own languages, something like this is deserving of jeering and laughter—or rather, of indignation. (4) But to persuade us to have congress with bodies that perish and lose our heavenly hope, they present us with a shameful narrative by this wonderful "prophet"; and in turn, they are not above reciting the amatory exploits of Aphrodite's whoredom in so many words.

---

[7] See Jub. 4.28. In the Genesis Apocryphon of the Qumran literature at 1QapGn col. 3 ll. 3; 8;12 (Wise et al. p. 76) Barthenos is Lamech's wife.

[8] See 21,2,5 p. 65.

[9] This story is found at Nat. Arc. 92,14-17.

[10] The building of the ark requires 100 years at Apocalypse of Paul 50 (H-R II p. 740); 300 at *Ginza* 409,4-5; 120 at Genesis Rabbah 30.7.

[11] At Apoc. Adam 69,1-75,14 Noah and his sons are represented as the servants of "god the almighty" = Sakla, rather than of the real God.

[12] See p. 65 n. 17.

[13] Cf. Fil. 33.6. At Eus. H. E. 4.7.7 Basilides is said to regard Barkabbas and Bar Koph as prophets.

2,5 Others of them in their turn introduce a fictitious work of pornography, a fabrication they have named by claiming that it is a "Gospel of Perfection." And truly, this is not a gospel of perfection but a dirge for it; all the perfection of death is contained in such devil's sowing.

2,6 Others are not ashamed to speak of a "Gospel of Eve." For they sow <their stunted> crop in her name because, supposedly, she obtained the food of knowledge by revelation from the serpent which spoke to her[14] And as, in his inconstant state of mind, the utterances of a man who is drunk and babbling at random cannot be alike, but some are made with laughter but others tearfully, the deceivers' sowing has come up to correspond with every sort of evil.

3,1 They begin with foolish visions and proof texts in what they claim is a Gospel. For they make this allegation: "I stood upon a lofty mountain, and saw a man who was tall, and another, little of stature.[15] And I heard as it were the sound of thunder and drew nigh to hear, and he spake with me and said, I am thou and thou art I, and wheresoever thou art, there am I;[16] and I am sown in all things. And from wheresoever thou wilt thou gatherest me, but in gathering me, thou gatherest thyself."[17] (2) What a devil's sowing! How has he managed to divert the minds of mankind and distract them from the telling of the truth to things that are foolish and untenable? A person with good sense hardly needs to formulate these people's refutation from scripture, illustrations or anything else. The acting out of the foolish words of adulterers and the putting of them into practice is plain for sound reason to see and detect.

3,3 Now in telling these stories and others like them, those who have yoked themselves to Nicolaus' sect for the sake of "knowledge" have lost the truth and not merely perverted their converts' minds, but have also enslaved their bodies and souls to fornication and promiscuity. They foul their supposed assembly itself with the dirt of promiscuous fornication and eat and handle both human flesh and uncleanness. (4) I would not dare to utter the whole of this if I were not somehow compelled to from the excess of the feeling of grief within me over the futile things they do—appalled

---

[14] See p. 265 n. 4. Cf. Nat. Arc. 89,31-90,11; Or. Wld. 118,24-119,18. On the subject see Pagels.

[15] Two spirits, a little one and a big one, appear at Dia. Sav. 136,17-23.

[16] Variations of this formula appear at GT 108; PS 2.96 (MacDermot pp. 231; 232; 233; Acts of John 100 (H-S II p. 185) Corp. Herm. 5:11; Hipp. Refut. 5.9. And see Marcus' speech to his female partner at Iren. 1.13.3.

[17] For comparable "gathering" see Tri. Trac. 66,24-25; Thunder 16,18-19; Man. Keph. 228,1-12; Man. Ps. at Allberry I p. 175,19.

as I am at the mass and depth of evils into which he enemy of mankind, the devil, leads those who trust him, so as to pollute the minds, hearts, hands, mouths, bodies and souls of the persons he has trapped in such deep darkness.

3,5 And I am afraid that I may be revealing the whole of this potent poison, like the face of some serpent's basilisk, to the harm of the readers rather than to their correction. Truly it pollutes the ears—the blasphemous assembly of great audacity, the gathering and the interpretation of its dirt, the mucky (βορβορώδης) perversity of the scummy obscenity. (6) Thus some actually call them "Borborians." But others call them Koddians—"*qodda*" means "dish" or "bowl" in Syriac—because no one can eat with them. Food is served to them separately in their defilement, and no one can eat even bread with them because of the pollution. (7) And so, regarding them as outcastes, their fellow immigrants have named them Koddians. But in Egypt the same people are known as Stratiotics and Phibionites, as I said in part earlier. But some call them Zacchaeans, others, Barbelites.

3,8 In any case, neither will I be able to pass them by; I am forced to speak out. <For> since the sacred Moses too writes by the Holy Spirit's inspiration, "Whoso seeth a murder and proclaimeth it not, let such a one be accursed,"[18] I cannot pass this great murder by, and this terrible murderous behavior, without making a full disclosure of it. (9) For perhaps, if I reveal this pitfall, like the "pit of destruction,"[19] to the wise, I shall arouse fear and horror in them, so that they will not only avoid this crooked serpent and basilisk that is in the pit, but stone it too, so that it will not even dare to approach anyone. And so much for the few things I have said about them up till now, as a partial account.

4,1 But I shall get right down to the worst part of the deadly description of them—for they vary in their wicked teaching of what they please—which is, first of all, that they hold their wives in common.[20] (2) And if a guest who is of their persuasion arrives, they have a sign that men give women and women give men, a tickling of the palm as they clasp hands in supposed greeting, to show that the visitor is of their religion.

4,3 And once they recognize each other from this they start feasting right away—and they set the table with lavish provisions for eating meat and drinking wine even if they are poor. But then, after a drinking bout and, let

---

[18] The source of this is unclear. Tardieu suggests Lev 5:1.

[19] Cf. Ps. 54:24

[20] Cf. Gos. Judas 38,16-19: (Some "priests") sacrifice their own children, others their wives, "in praise and humility with each other".

us say, stuffing their overstuffed veins,[21] they get hot for each other next. (4) And the husband will move away from his wife and tell her—speaking to his own wife!—"Get up, perform the Agape[22] with the brother." And when the wretched couple has made love—and I am truly ashamed to mention the vile things they do, for as the holy apostle says, "It is a shame even to speak" of what goes on among them. Still, I should not be ashamed to say what they are not ashamed to do, to arouse horror by every means in those who hear what obscenities they are prepared to perform. (5) For after having made love with the passion of fornication in addition, to lift their blasphemy up to heaven, the woman and man receive the man's emission on their own hands. And they stand with their eyes raised heavenward but the filth on their hands and pray, if you please—(6) the ones they call Stratiotics and Gnostics—and offer that stuff on their hands to the true Father of all,[23] and say, "We offer thee this gift, the body of Christ." (7) And then they eat it[24] partaking of their own dirt, and say, "This is the body of Christ; and this is the Pascha, because of which our bodies suffer and are compelled to acknowledge the passion of Christ."

4,8 And so with the woman's emission when she happens to be having her period—they likewise take the unclean menstrual blood they gather from her, and eat it in common. And "This," they say, "is the blood of Christ." (5,1) And so, when they read, "I saw a tree bearing twelve manner of fruits every year, and he said unto me, "This is the tree of life," in apocryphal writings,[25] they interpret this allegorically of the menstrual flux.

5,2 But although they have sex with each other they renounce procreation.[26] It is for enjoyment, not procreation, that they eagerly pursue seduction, since the devil is mocking people like these, and making fun of the creature fashioned by God. (3) They come to climax but absorb the seeds of their dirt, not by implanting them for procreation, but by eating the dirty stuff themselves.

5,4 But even though one of them should accidentally implant the seed of his natural emission prematurely and the woman becomes pregnant,

---

[21] ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν τὰς φλέβας τοῦ κόπου ἐμπλήσαντες Or: practically stuffing the boy's (κόρου) veins. Epiph could be recalling some experience of his own.

[22] So Benko. Tardieu renders simply fais l'amour.

[23] Rather than to the gnostic god

[24] The practice is mentioned, and sharply condemned at PS 4.147 (MacDermot p. 381) and 2 Jeu 43 (MacDermot p. 100). Christians are accused of it by Mandaeans at *Ginza* 229,20-22.

[25] Cf. Rev 22:1-2. Epiph might have mistaken the source of the quotation, or indeed seen it so worded in some apocryphon.

[26] See the polemic against procreation at Test. Tr. 30,2-17.

listen to a more dreadful thing that such people venture to do. (5) They extract the fetus at the stage which is appropriate for their enterprise, take this aborted infant, and cut it up in a trough with a pestle. And they mix honey, pepper, and certain other perfumes and spices with it to keep from getting sick, and then all the revellers in this <herd> of swine and dogs assemble, and each eats a piece of the child with his fingers.[27] (6) And now, after this cannibalism, they pray to God and say, "We were not mocked by the archon of lust, but have gathered the brother's blunder up!" And this, if you please, is their idea of the "perfect Passover."

5,7 And they are prepared to do any number of other dreadful things. Again, whenever they feel excitement within them they soil their own hands with their own ejaculated dirt, get up, and pray stark naked with their hands defiled. The idea is that they <can> obtain freedom of access to God by a practice of this kind.

5,8 Man and woman, they pamper their bodies night and day, anointing themselves, bathing, feasting, spending their time in whoring and drunkenness. And they curse anyone who fasts[28] and say, "Fasting is wrong; fasting belongs to this archon who made the world. We must take nourishment to make our bodies strong, and able to render their fruit in its season."

6,1 They use both the Old and the New Testaments, but renounce the Speaker in the Old Testament.[29] And whenever they find a text the sense of which can be against them, they say that this has been said by the spirit of the world. (2) But if a statement can be represented as resembling their lust—not as the text is, but as their deluded minds take it—they twist it to fit their lust and claim that it has been spoken by the Spirit of truth. (3) And this, they claim, is what the Lord said of John, "What went ye out into the wilderness for to see? A reed shaken with the wind?"[30] John was not perfect, they say; he was inspired by many spirits, like a reed stirring in every wind. (4) And when the spirit of the archon came he would preach Judaism; but when the Holy Spirit came he would speak of Christ. And this is the meaning of "He that is least in the Kingdom"[31] <and so on>. "He said this of us," they say, "because the least of us is greater than he."

7,1 Such persons are silenced at once by the truth itself. For from the context of each saying the truth will be plainly shown and the trustworthiness

---

[27] Mandaeans accuse Christians of this at *Ginza* 136,12-13.

[28] Fasting is condemned for other reasons. at GT 14; 104 and at Gos. Judas 40,12-13. The Mandaean *Ginza* 136,12-13; 34-39 condemns the Christian practice of fasting.

[29] The "God of the Law" as such is condemned at Test. Tr. 45,23-48,26.

[30] Matt 11:7

[31] Matt 11:11

of the text demonstrated. (2) If John had worn soft clothing and lived in kings' houses the saying would fit him exactly and be in direct refutation of him. But if <it says>, "What went ye out for to see? A man clothed in soft raiment?"[32] and John was not such a man, then the saying's accusation cannot apply to John, who did not wear soft clothing. The reference is to those who expected to find John like that, and who were often hypocritically flattered by persons who lived indoors, in kings' houses. (3) For they thought that they could go out and get praises and congratulations from John as well, for the transgressions they committed every day. (4) But when they did not they were reprovingly told by the Savior, "What did you expect to find? A man borne hither and yon with you by your passions, like people in soft clothing? No! John is no reed shaken by men's opinions, like a reed swayed by the authority of every wind."

7,5 Since the Savior did say, "Among them that are born of woman there is none greater than John,"[33] as a safeguard for us, lest any think that John was greater than even the Savior himself—who was also born of woman, of the ever-virgin Mary through the Holy Spirit—he said that he who is "less" than John, meaning in the length of his incarnate life, is greater in the kingdom of heaven. (6) For since the Savior was born six months after the birth of John, it is plain that he <appeared younger than he>—though he was older than John, for he was always, and is. But to whom is this not plain? So all the things they say are worthless fabrication, good things turned into bad.

8,1 And they too have lots of books. They publish certain "Questions of Mary"; but others offer many books about the Ialdabaoth we spoke of, and in the name of Seth.[34] They call others "Apocalypses of Adam[35] and have ventured to compose other Gospels in the names of the disciples, and are not ashamed to say that our Savior and Lord himself, Jesus Christ, revealed this obscenity. (2) For in the so-called "Greater Questions of Mary"—there are also "Lesser" ones forged by them—they claim that he reveals it to her after taking her aside on the mountain, praying, producing a woman from his side, beginning to have sex with her, and then partaking of his emission, if you please, to show that "Thus we must do, that we may live." (3) And when Mary was alarmed and fell to the ground, he raised her up and said to her, "O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?"[36]

---

[32] Matt 11:8
[33] Matt 11:11
[34] Cf. The titles of CG VII,2, The Second Treatise of the Great Seth, and CG VII,5, The Three Steles of Seth.
[35] Cf. The title of CG V,5, The Apocalypse of Adam.
[36] Matt 14:31

8,4 And they say that this is the meaning of the saying in the Gospel, "If I have told you earthly things and ye believe not, how shall ye believe the heavenly things?"[37] and so of, "When ye see the Son of Man ascending up where he was before"[38]—in other words, when you see the emission being partaken of where it came from. (5) And when Christ said, "Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood,"[39] and the disciples were disturbed and replied, "Who can hear this?"[40] they say his saying was about the dirt. (6) And this is why they were disturbed and fell away; they were not entirely stable yet, they say.

8,7 And when David says, "He shall be like a tree planted by the outgoings of water that will bring forth its fruit in due season,"[41] they say he is speaking of the man's dirt. "By the outgoing of water," and, "that will bring forth his fruit," means the emission at climax. And "Its leaf shall not fall off" means, "We do not allow it to fall to the ground, but eat it ourselves."

9,1 And so as not to do more harm than good by making their proof-texts public, I am going to omit most of them—otherwise I would cite all their wicked sayings and go through them here. (2) When it says that Rahab put a scarlet thread in her window, this was not scarlet thread, they tell us, but the female organs. And the scarlet thread means the menstrual blood, and "Drink water from your cisterns"[42] refers to the same.

9,3 They say that the flesh must perish and cannot be raised, and this belongs to the archon. (4) But the power in the menses and organs is soul, they say, "which we gather and eat. And whatever we eat—meat, vegetables, bread or anything else—we are doing creatures a favor by gathering the soul[43] from them all and taking it to the heavens with us." Hence they eat meat of all kinds and say that this is "to show mercy to our race." (5) And they claim that the same soul has been implanted in animals, insects, fish, snakes, men—and in vegetation, trees, and the fruits of the soil.[44]

---

[37] Cf. John 3:12.
[38] John 6:62
[39] John 6:53
[40] John 6:60
[41] Ps. 1:3
[42] Prov. 5:15
[43] This idea is fundamental to Manichaean practice: see, e.g., Man. Keph. 191,16-17; 212,10-22; 236,7-27. And see Iren. 1.30.14: consummationem autem futuram, quando tota humectatio spiritus luminis collegatur.
[44] A comparable idea is found at PS 25 (MacDermot pp. 34-35) Man. Keph. 124,3-6; 210,24-25; Man. Hom. 27,11-16; Corp. Herm. 10.7.

9,6 Those of them who are called Phibionites offer their shameful sacrifices of fornication, which I have already mentioned here, in 365[45] names which they have invented themselves as names of supposed archons, making fools of their female partners and saying, "Have sex with me, so that I may offer you to the archon." (7) And at each act of intercourse they pronounce an outlandish name[46] of one of their fictitious archons, and pray, if you please, by saying, "I offer this to thee, So-and-so, that thou mayest offer it to So-and-so." But at another act he supposes again that he is likewise offering it to another archon, so that he too may offer it to the other. (8) And until he mounts, or rather, sinks, through 365 falls of copulation, he calls on some name at each, and does the same sort of thing. Then he starts back down through the same acts, performing the same obscenities and making fools of his female victims. (9) Now when he reaches a mass as great as that of a total number of 730 falls—I mean the falls of unnatural unions and the names they have made up—then finally a man of this sort has the hardihood to say, "I am Christ, for I have descended from on high through the names of the 365 archons!"

10,1 They say that these are the names of the archons they consider the greatest, although they say there are many.[47] In the first heaven is the archon Iao. In the second, they say, is Saklas,[48] the archon of fornication. In the third, they say, is the archon Seth and in the fourth, they say, is Davides. (2) For they suppose that there is a fourth heaven, and a third—and a fifth, another heaven, in which they say is Eloaeus, also called Adonaeus. Some of them say that Ialdabaoth is in the sixth heaven, some say Elilaeus. (3) But they suppose that there is another, seventh heaven, and say that Sabaoth is in that. But others disagree, and say that Ialdabaoth is in the seventh.

10,4 But in the eighth heaven they put the so-called Barbelo;[49] and the "Father and Lord of all," the same Self-begetter;[50] and another Christ, a

---

[45] See n. 78 p. 6.

[46] For the powers "each in its own name" see Clem. Strom. 3.4.29.2, and cf. Iren. 1.31.2.

[47] Comparable lists are found at Iren. 1.30.5; Orig Cels. 6,31; Apocry. Jn. II,1 11,19-12,33.

[48] In NHC Saklas ("Fool") is an alternate name for Ialdabaoth at Nat. Arc. 95,5-8. At Gos. Egyp. 56,16-19 he is the "begetting spirit of the earth";at Apoc. Ad. 74,7-30 "the god of the aeons"; at Apocry. Jn. 16,32, a demon. At Gos. Judas 51 Yaltabaoth and Saklas are among the twelve angels who rule over the abyss.

[49] At Or. Wld. 121,28-35 Sophia Zoe lives in the "first heaven." At Eug. 89,9 the heavens are made for the glory of Immortal Man and Sophia his consort.

[50] αὐτογενής. The "divine Autogenes" or the like is found in five NHC tractates, most often in Apocry. Jn., Gos. Egyp. and Zost. At Apocry. Jn. II,1 7,19-20; 8,23; 9,1-2 the divine Autogenes is "the Christ" or "Christ."

self-engendered one,[51] and our Christ,[52] who descended and revealed this knowledge to men, who they say is also called Jesus. (5) But he is not "born of Mary" but "revealed through Mary." And he has not taken flesh but is only appearance.

10,6 Some say Sabaoth has the face of an ass;[53] others, the face of a pig.[54] This, they say, is why is why he forbade the Jews to eat pork. He is the maker of heaven, earth, the heavens after him, and his own angels. (7) In departing this world the soul makes its way through these archons, but no <one> can get through them unless he is in full possession of this "knowledge"—or rather, this contemptibility—and escapes the archons and authorities because he is "filled."[55]

10,8 The archon who holds this world captive is shaped like a dragon.[56] He swallows[57] souls that are not in the know, and returns them to the world through his phallus, here <to be implanted> in pigs and other animals, and brought up again through them.

10,9 But, say they, if one becomes privy to this knowledge and gathers himself from the world through the menses and the emission of lust, he is detained here no longer; he gets up above these archons. (10) They say that he passes Sabaoth by and—with impudent blasphemy—that he treads on his head. And thus he mounts above him to the height, where the Mother of the living, Barbero or Barbelo, is, and so the soul is saved.

10,11 The wretches also say that Sabaoth has hair like a woman's.[58] They think that the term, Sabaoth, is some archon, not realizing that where scripture says, "Thus saith Lord Sabaoth" it has not given anyone's

---

[51] αὐτολόχευτον. "The divine Autogenes, Christ," is found at Apocry. Jn. II.1 9,2 and III,1 13,6; 11,8-9; "the great Logos, the Autogenes" at Gos. Egyp. III,2 50,18-19; "the great self-begotten living Word" at Gos. Egyp. IV,2 60,1-2; 65,5-6; 66,17-18. The expression, "Self-begotten Christ" as such does not occur in NHC but see the preceding note.

[52] See Or. Wld. 105, 25-29, . . . another being, called Jesus Christ, who resembles the savior above in the eighth heaven and who sits at his right upon a revered throne . . .

[53] An ass-faced archon is mentioned, e.g., at Apocry Jn. 11, 27-28; the fragment of Jeu at MacDermot, *Books of Jeu*, p. 141; Orig. Cels. 6.30.

[54] A pig-faced archon is mentioned at 2 Jeu 43 (MacDermot *Books of Jeu*, p. 101).

[55] "Filled" is a term of approbation common in the religious literature of the early Christian centuries. See, among many other examples, 1 Cor 4:8; Eph 3:19; Col 2:10 and in NHC Apocry. Jas. 2,29-35; 3,34-37.

[56] For the dragon-shaped archon see, e.g., Apocry. Jn. II,1 11,30-32; Man. Keph. 33,33; 77,33; Man. Ps. 57,18 (Allberry II p. 208).

[57] See PS 3.126 (MacDermot pp. 317-319) and cf. 1.26-27 (MacDermot pp. 36-38); in Mandaean literature *Ginza* 433,36; *Johannesbuch* 191,4-5; in NHC perhaps Dia. Sav. 122.19.

[58] Cf. The long-haired temptress archon Paraplex is found at PS 4.139 (MacDermot p. 359).

name, but a term of praise for the Godhead. (12) Translated from Hebrew, "Sabaoth" means "Lord of hosts." Wherever "Sabaoth" occurs in the Old Testament, it suggests a host; hence Aquila everywhere renders "Adonai Sabaoth" as "Lord of armies." (13) But since these people are frantic against their Master in every way they go looking for the one who does not exist, and have lost the one who does. Or rather, they have lost themselves.

11,1 <They do> any number of other <things> and it is a misfortune to speak of their mad behavior in them. Some of them do not have to do with women, if you please, but pollute themselves with their own hands, receive their own dirt on their hands, and then eat it. (2) For this they cite a slanderously interpreted text, "These hands sufficed, not only for me, but also for them that were with me"—and again, "Working with your hands, that ye may have to give also to them that need."[59] (3) And I believe that the Holy Spirit was moved to anger over these persons in the apostle Jude, I mean in the General Epistle written by Jude. ("Jude" is our Jude, the brother of James, and called the Lord's brother.) For the Holy Spirit taught, with Jude's voice, that they are debauched and debauch like cattle, as he says, "Insofar as they know not, they are guilty of ignorance, and insofar as they know they are debauched, even as brute beasts."[60] (4) For they dispose of their corruption like dogs and pigs. Dogs and pigs, and other animals as well, are polluted in this way and eat their bodies' discharge.

11,5 For in fact they really do "defile the flesh while dreaming, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities. But Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, brought not a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee. (6) But these speak evil of things which they naturally know not."[61] For they blaspheme the holiest of holy things, bestowed on us with sanctification, by turning them into dirt.

11,7 And these are the things they have ventured to say against the apostles, as the blessed Paul also says, "So that some dare <blasphemously to report> of us that we say, Let us do evil that good may come upon us; whose damnation is just."[62] (8) And how many other texts I could cite against the blasphemers! For these persons who debauch themselves with their own hands—and not just they, but the ones who consort with women too—finally get their fill of promiscuous relations with women and grow

[59] Eph. 4:28
[60] Jude 10
[61] Jude 8-10
[62] Rom 3:8

ardent for each other, men for men, "receiving in themselves the recompense of their error"[63] as the scripture says. For once they are completely ruined they congratulate each other on having received the highest rank.[64]

11,9 Moreover they deceive the womenfolk who put their trust in them, "laden with sins and led away with divers lusts,"[65] and tell their female dupes, "So-and-so is a virgin"—one who has been debauched for so many years, and is being debauched every day! For they never have their fill of copulation, but in their circles the more indecent a man is, the more praiseworthy they consider him. (10) They say that virgins are women who have never gone on to the point of being inseminated in normal marital relations of the customary kind. They have sex all the time and commit fornication, but before the pleasure of their union is consummated they push their villainous seducer away and take the dirt we spoke of for food—(11) comparably to Shelah's perversity with Tamar. <They boast of virginity>, but instead of virginity have adopted this technique of being seduced without accepting the union of seduction, and the seminal discharge.[66]

11,12 They blaspheme not only Abraham, Moses, Elijah and the whole choir of prophets, but the God who chose them as well.[67] (12,1) Indeed, they have ventured countless other forgeries. They say that one book is a "Birth of Mary," and they palm some horrid, baneful things off in it and say that they get them from it. (2) On its authority they say that Zacharias was killed in the temple because he had seen a vision, and when he wanted to reveal the vision his mouth was stopped from fright. For at the hour of incense, while he was burning it, he saw a man standing there, they say, with the form of an ass.[68] (3) And when he had come out and wanted to say "Woe to you, whom are you worshiping?" the person he had seen inside in the temple stopped his mouth so that he could not speak. But when his mouth was opened so that he could speak, then he revealed it to them and they killed him. And that, they say, is how Zacharias died. (4) This, they say, is why the priest was ordered to wear bells by the lawgiver himself.[69] Whenever he went in to officiate, the object of his worship

---

[63] Rom 1:27

[64] Hipp. Refut. 6.19.5 says, of Simonians, μακαρίζουσιν ἑαυτοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ ξένῃ μίξει, ταύτην εἶναι λέγοντες τὴν τέλειαν ἀγάπην.

[65] 2 Tim 3:6

[66] Epiph makes the same accusation in Sect 63, against the group he calls "The first type of Origenist, who are shamefully behaved as well."

[67] Cf. Iren. I.30.10-11.

[68] Cf. Tacitus Historiae 4; Tert. Apol. 16.1-5, and see n. 43 above.

[69] Cf. Exod 28:33-34.

would hear them jangle and hide, so that no one would spy the imaginary face of his form.

12,5 But all their silliness is an easy business to refute, and chock-full of absurdity. If the object of their service were visible at all, he could not be hidden. But if he could be hidden at all he could not be visible. (6) And again, we must put it to them differently: If he was visible, then he was a body and could not be a spirit. But if he was spirit, he could not be counted among the things that are visible. And since he was not something visible, how could he provide for the reduction of his size at the jangling of bells? For since he was by nature invisible, he would not be seen unless he wished to be. (7) But even though he was seen, he would not have appeared of necessity because his nature required him to appear; he must have appeared as a favor—not manifesting his appearance inadvertently, fearfully and with unease if there was no sound of bells. And thus their false, spurious statement has failed from every standpoint.

12,8 And there are many other foolish things that they say. <For they say Zacharias was killed—and they are right>—although Zacharias was surely not killed immediately. Indeed he was still alive after John's birth, and prophesied the Lord's advent, and his birth in the flesh of the holy Virgin Mary, through the Holy Spirit. (9) As he says, "And thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the highest; for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways.[70]...To turn the hearts of the fathers unto the children, and the disobedient to wisdom," and so on. And how much else is there to say about their lying and their pollution?

13,1 The ones they call "Levites" do not have to do with women, but with each other. And these are their supposedly distinguished and praiseworthy persons! And then they make fun of those who practice asceticism, chastity and celibacy, as having taken the trouble for nothing.

13,2 They cite a fictitious Gospel in the name of the holy disciple, Philip,[71] as follows. "The Lord hath shown me what my soul must say on its ascent to heaven, and how it must answer each of the powers on high.[72] 'I have recognized myself,' it saith, 'and gathered myself from every quarter, and have sown no children for the archon. But I have pulled up his roots,

---

[70] Luke 1:17

[71] The quotation which follows is not found in the NHC Gospel of Philip.

[72] The soul makes such a speech at Iren. 1.21.5; Orig. Cels. 6.31; and in NHC at Apoc. Paul 23,1-28; 1 Apoc. Jas 33,2-36,1, and see Cod. Tch. James 19,26-22,20. There may be a reference to it at Apocry. Jas. 8,35-36. See also Gos. Mary BG 8502,1 15,1-17,7. At PS 3.112 (MacDermot pp. 286-291) the soul escapes the archons by repeating mysteries to them; a speech for it to make is found on p. 289.

and gathered my scattered members, and I know who thou art. For I,' it saith, 'am of the ones on high.'" And so, they say, it is set free. (3) But if it turns out to have fathered a son, it is detained below until it can take its own children up and restore them to itself.

13,4 And their silly fictions are of such a character that they even dare to blaspheme the holy Elijah, and say that when he was taken up he was cast back down into the world. (5) For they say that one she-demon came and caught hold of him[73] and said to him, "Whither goest thou? For I have children of thee, and thou canst not ascend and leave thy children here." And he replied, they say, "Whence hast thou children of me, seeing I lived in purity?" And she answered, "Yea, for when oft, in dreaming dreams, thou wert voided of bodies in thine emission, it was I that received the seeds of thee and bare thee sons."[74]

13,6 How silly the people are who say this sort of thing! How can a demon, an invisible spirit with no body, receive anything <from> bodies? But if she does receive something from bodies and become pregnant, she cannot be a spirit, but must be a body. And being a body, how can she be invisible and a spirit?

13,7 And their drivel is simply outrageous. They like to cite the text which tells against them, if you please, the one from Epistle of Jude, in their own favor instead—where he says, "And they that dream defile the flesh, despise dominion and speak evil of dignities."[75] But the blessed Jude, the Lord's brother, did not say this of bodily dreamers. He goes right on to show that he means dreamers <in mind>, who utter their words as though they were dreaming and not in the waking state of the alertness of their reasoning powers. (8) (Even of the teachers at Jerusalem in fact, Isaiah says, "They are all dumb dogs, they cannot bark, dreaming on their couches,"[76] and so on.) And here in the Epistle of Jude, Jude shows (that this is what he means) by saying, "speaking of that they know not."[77] And he proved that he did not mean dreaming while asleep, but was saying of their fictitious bombast and nonsense that it was spoken in their sleep, not with a sound mind.

---

[73] Gershom Scholem suggested that this is a parody of a Jewish story in which the prophet Elijah vanquishes the demoness Lilith. See Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism* pp. 73-74.

[74] This folk belief is attested at the Mandaean *Ginza* 50,8-11. At Corp. Herm. 9.3 it is used as an image of the mind and its ideas.

[75] Jude 8

[76] Isa 56:10

[77] Cf. Jude 10.

14,1 It is truly a misfortune for me to tell all this; only God can close this stinking pit. And I shall go on from here, praying the all-sovereign God that no one has been trapped in the mud, and that his mind has not absorbed any of the reeking filth. (2) For in the first place the apostle Paul grubs up the entire root of their wickedness with his injunction about younger widows: "Younger widows refuse, for after they have waxed wanton against Christ they will marry; having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith . . . But let them marry, bear children, guide the house."[78] (3) But if the apostle says to bear children, but they decline procreation, it is the enterprise of a serpent and of false doctrine. Because they are mastered by the pleasure of fornication they invent excuses for their uncleanness, so that their licentiousness may appear to fulfill (Paul's commandment).

14,4 Really these things should neither be said nor considered worth mentioning in treatises, but buried like a foul corpse exuding a pestilent vapor, to protect people from injury even through their sense of hearing. (5) And if a sect of this kind had passed away and no longer existed, it would be better to bury it and say nothing about it at all. But since it does exist and has practitioners, and I have been urged by your Honors to speak of all the sects, I have been forced to describe parts of it, in order, in all frankness, not to pass them over but describe them, for the protection of the hearers—but for the banishment of the practitioners. (6) For where can I not find proof of their murders and monstrous deeds, and of the devil's rites which have been given the nuts by the inspiration of that same devil?

15,1 They are proved wrong at once in what they imagine and allege about the tree in the First Psalm of which it is said that it will "bring forth his fruit in due season, and his leaf shall not fall." For before that it says, "His delight is in the Law of the Lord, and in his Law will he exercise himself day and night."[79] But these people deny the Law and the prophets. (2) And if they deny the Lord's Law, together with the Law they are also slandering the One who spoke in the Law. They are wrong as to the meaning of the truth and have lost it, and they neither believe in judgment nor acknowledge resurrection.

15,3 They reap the fruit of the things they do in the body to glut themselves with pleasure through being driven insane by the devil's pleasures and lusts.[80] Of this they are altogether and everywhere convicted by

---

[78] 1 Tim 5:11; 14

[79] Ps. 1:3; 2

[80] I.e., their devil-inspired madness is reflected in their inability to interpret scripture correctly.

the speech of the truth. (4) John says, "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine."[81] Which doctrine? "If any confess not that Christ is come in the flesh, this is an antichrist. Even now there are many antichrists"[82]—meaning that those who do not acknowledge that Christ has come in the flesh are antichrists.

15,5 Moreover the Savior himself says, "They which shall be accounted worthy of the kingdom of heaven neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are equal unto the angels."[83] (6) And not only that, but to show (his) manifest chastity[84] and the holiness which is achieved through the solitary life, he tells Mary, "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father"[85]—proving that chastity has no congress with bodies and no sexual relations.

15,7 Furthermore in another passage the Holy Spirit says prophetically, both for the ancients and for <the> generations to come, "Blessed is the barren that is undefiled, which hath not known the bed sinfully; and the eunuch which with his hand hath wrought no iniquity"[86]—ruling out the indecencies with the hands which are sanctioned by their myth.

16,1 And how much else there is to say! In one passage the apostle says, "He that is unmarried, and the virgin, careth for the things of the Lord, how he may please the Lord"[87]—and he says this to show (his) true chastity, at the Holy Spirit's solemn bidding. But he then says of the lawfully married, "Marriage is honorable, and the bed undefiled; but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge."[88] (2) Furthermore he cries out against them in his letter to the Romans, and exposes the obscenities of those who commit the misdeeds by saying, "For even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature"—and of the males, "men with men working that which is unseemly."[89] (3) Moreover in the Epistle to Timothy he says of them, "In the last days perilous times shall come, for men shall be lovers of pleasure";[90] and again, "forbidding to marry, having their consciences seared with an hot iron."[91] (4) For they forbid chaste wedlock

---

[81] 2 John 10
[82] 2 John 1:7; 1 John 2:18
[83] Luke 20:35-36
[84] See 16,1 below
[85] John 20:7
[86] Wisd Sol 3:13-14
[87] 1 Cor 7:32; 34
[88] Heb 13:4
[89] Rom 1:27
[90] 2 Tim 3:1;2;4
[91] 1 Tim 4:2-3

and procreation, but are seared in their consciences since they have sex and pollute themselves, and yet hinder procreation.

16,5 Indeed it is already shown by the prophet, even from the first, that the very thing they call a sacrifice, filthy thing that it is, is snake's flesh and not, heaven forbid, the Lord's—for he says, "Thou brakest the head of the dragon, and gavest him to be meat for the peoples of Ethiopia."[92] (6) For their loathsome worship is truly snake's food, and those who celebrate this rite of Zeus—a daemon now but once a sorcerer, (7) whom some people futilely take for a god—are Ethiopians made black by sin.

For all the sects have gathered imposture for themselves from the Greek mythology, and altered it by making it mean something else which is worse. (8) The poets introduce Zeus as having swallowed Wisdom, his own daughter. But no one could swallow a baby—and to poke fun at the disgusting activities of the Greek gods St. Clement said that Zeus could not have swallowed the baby if he swallowed Wisdom, but <the myth of Zeus appears> to mean its own child.[93]

17,1 But what else should I say? Or how shall I shake off this filthy burden since I am both willing and unwilling to speak—compelled to, lest I appear to be concealing any of the facts, and yet afraid that by revealing their horrid activities I may soil or wound those who are given to pleasures and lusts, or incite them to take too much interest in this? (2) In any case may I, and all the <body>[94] of the holy catholic church, and all the readers of this book, remain unharmed by such a suggestion of the devil and his mischief! (3) For if I were to start <in> again on the other things they say and do—which are like these and as numerous, and still more grave and <worse>—and if, for a curative drug, I should also wish to match a remedy, like an antidote, with each thing they say, I would make a heavy task of composing this treatise.

17,4 For I happened on this sect myself, beloved, and was actually taught these things in person, out of the mouths of people who really undertook them. Not only did women under this delusion offer me this line of talk, and divulge this sort of thing to me. With impudent boldness moreover, they even tried to seduce me themselves—like that murderous, villainous Egyptian wife of the chief cook—because they wanted me in my youth.

---

[92] Ps 73:13-14
[93] Cf. Ps.-Clem Hom. 4.16.2.
[94] Text: ἐλπίς Holl: σύστασις

(5) But he who stood by the holy Joseph then, stood by me as well. And when, in my unworthiness and inadequacy, I had called on the One who rescued Joseph then, and was shown mercy and escaped their murderous hands, I too could sing a hymn to God the all-holy and say, "Let us sing to the Lord for he is gloriously magnified; horse and rider hath he thrown into the sea."[95]

17,6 For it was not by a power like that of Joseph's righteousness but by my groaning to God, that I was pitied and rescued. For when I was reproached by the baneful women themselves, I laughed at the way persons of their kind were whispering to each other, jokingly if you please, "We can't save the kid; we've left him in the hands of the archon to perish!" (7) (For whichever is prettier flaunts herself as bait, so that they claim to "save"—instead of destroying—the victims of their deceit through her. And then the plain one gets blamed by the more attractive ones, and they say, "I'm an elect vessel and can save the suckers[96] but you couldn't!")

17,8 Now the women who taught this dirty myth were very lovely in their outward appearance but in their wicked minds they had all the devil's ugliness. But the merciful God rescued me from their wickedness, so that after reading their books, understanding their real intent and not being carried away with it, and after escaping without taking the bait, (9) I lost no time reporting them to the bishops who were there, and finding out which ones were hidden in the church. <Thus> they were expelled from the city, about 80 persons, and the city was cleared of their tare-like, thorny growth.

18,1 Perhaps someone, if he remembers my promise I made earlier, may even commend me. I indicated before that I have encountered some of the sects, though I know some from documentary sources, and some from the instruction and testimony of trustworthy men who were able to tell me the truth. So here too, in all frankness, I have not avoided the subject, but have shown what this one of the sects which came my way is like. (2) And I could speak plainly of it because of things which I did not do—heaven forbid!—but which <I knew> by learning them in exact detail from persons who were trying to convert me to this and did not succeed. They lost their hope of my destruction instead, and did not attain the goal of the plot that they and the devil in them were attempting against my poor soul (3) so that,

---

[95] Exod 15:1

[96] ἀπατώμενοι persons to be deceived. For "dupes," meaning those who are already members of a sect, Epiph normally says ἠπατημένοι.

with the most holy David, I may say that "Their blows were weapons of babes,"[97] and so on, and, "Their travail shall return upon their own head, and their wickedness shall fall upon their own pate."[98]

18,4 As I encountered and escaped them, read, understood and despised, and passed them by, so, reader, I urge you in your turn to read, despise <their pernicious doctrine> and pass by, so that you will not fall into the depravity of these wicked serpents. (5) But if you should ever happen on any of this school of snake-like persons, may you pick the wood the Lord has made ready for us right up, the wood on which our Lord Christ was nailed. <And> may you hurl it at the serpent's head at once, and say, "Christ has been crucified for us, leaving us an example'[99] of salvation. (6) For he would not have been crucified if he had not had flesh. But since he had flesh and was crucified, he has crucified our sins. I am held fast by faith in the truth, not carried off by the serpent's false imposture and the seductive whisper of his teaching."

19,1 Now, beloved, having passed this sect by I am going to tread the other rough tracks next—not to walk on them but to teach, from a safe distance, such as are willing to recognize the roughest spots and flee by the narrow, arduous path that leads to eternal life, and leave the road which is broad and roomy, and yet thorny, full of stumbling-blocks, miry, and choked with licentiousness and fornication. (2) The like of this fornication and licentiousness may be seen in the extremely dreadful snake the ancients called the pangless viper."[100]

19,3 For the nature of such a viper is similar to the wickedness of these people. In performing their filthy act either with men or with women they forbear insemination, rendering impossible the procreation God has given his creatures—as the apostle says, "receiving in themselves the recompense of their error which was meet,"[101] and so on. (4) So, we are told, when the pangless viper grew amorous, female for male and male for female, they would twine together, and the male would thrust his head into the female's gaping jaws. And she, in the throes of passion, would bite off the male's head and so swallow the poison that dripped from its mouth, and conceive a pair of snakes of the same kind within her, a male and a female. (5) When this pair had come to maturity in her belly and had no way of being born,

---

[97] Ps 63:8
[98] Ps. 63:8
[99] 1 Pet 2:21
[100] ἀπειρώδινος ἔχιδνα
[101] Rom 1:27

they would tear their mother's side and be born like that, so that both their father and their mother perished. This is why they called it the pangless viper; it has no experience of the pangs of birth. (6) It is more dreadful and fearsome than all the snakes, since it carries out its own extermination within itself and receives its dirt by mouth; and this crack-brained sect is like it. And now that we have beaten its head, body and offspring here with the wood of life, let us go on to examine the others calling, as our help, on God, to whom be honor and might forever and ever. Amen.

27.

Against Carpocratians[1] *Number seven, but number twenty-seven of the series*

1,1 Carpocrates makes another, for he founded his own unlawful school of his falsely named opinion, and his character is the worst of all. (2) (For the sect of what is falsely termed "Knowledge," which called its members Gnostics, arose from all of these—Simon and Menander, Satornilus, Basilides and Nicolaus, Carpocrates himself, and further, because of Valentinus. I have already given a description of one branch of it—the "Knowledgeable," though in their behavior they are despicable.)

2,1 Carpocrates says in his turn that there is one first principle on high, and just like the others he wants to introduce a Father of all, unknowable and unnameable. But he says that the world, and everything in the world, has been made by the angels, who are far inferior to the unknowable Father.[2] For he says that they rebelled against the power on high, and therefore have made the world.

2,2[3] And he says that Jesus our Lord was begotten of Joseph, just as all men were generated from a man's seed and a woman.[4] He is like all men but is different in his life—in prudence, virtue and a life of righteousness.[5]

---

[1] This Sect reads like an expansion of Iren. 1.25.1-6, although the repetitiousness of the sentences in 2,2-7 suggests a combination of this source with Hipp. Synt. Hipp. Refut. 7.32 reads like a condensation of Irenaeus. Justin Dial. 35.6 and Orig. Cels. 5.62 mention Carpocratians/Harpocratians. Eus. H. E. 4.7.9-11 and Tert. De Anima 23.2; 35.1-2 are dependent on Irenaeus. The brief PsT 3.1 and Fil 35 agree more closely with each other than with Irenaeus or Hipp. Refut. and may represent Hipp. Synt.

[2] Iren. 1.25.1; PsT 3.1; Fil. 35.1.

[3] Cf. PsT 3.1; Fil. 35.2. However, the material from this point through 3,11 is taken almost word for word from Iren. 1.25.1-2. Cf. also Hipp. Refut. 7.32.1-3.

[4] See also PsT 3.1; Fil. 35.2. And perhaps cf. Melch. 5,2-3: they will say of him that he is unbegotten though he has been begotten.

[5] See also PsT 3.1; Fil. 35.3.

(3) Because he received a more vigorous soul than other men's, and he remembered what it had seen on high when it was on the unknowable Father's carousel,[6] powers were sent to his soul by the Father (4) so that it would be able to recall what it had seen, and gain the power to escape the angels who made the world by progressing through all the acts in the world and all the deeds that men can do, even strange, unlawful works done in secret (5)—and so this same soul of Jesus, once freed by all he acts, could ascend to the same unknowable Father who had sent it the powers from above in order that it could win through to him on high by progressing through all the acts and being released.

2,6 And what is more, the souls like his <which> embrace the same experiences as his can be freed in the same way and soar aloft to the unknowable Father, by performing all the acts, and similarly being quit of them all and then released.

2,7 Though it had been reared in Jewish customs Jesus' soul despised them[7] and for that reason received powers by which it could <put> the passions <to rest>[8] which accrue to man as punishments, and rise above the world's creators. (8) But not only Jesus' soul itself has this capacity; the soul as well that can progress through <all> the acts will rise above these angels who made the world. It too will <soar aloft>—like Jesus' soul, as I said—if it receives powers and does the same sort of thing.

2,9 Hence these victims of this fraud's deception have become so extremely arrogant that they consider themselves superior even to Jesus. (10) Some of them say that they are not superior to Jesus, but are to Peter, Andrew, Paul and the other apostles, because of the superiority of their knowledge and their greater progress in the achievement of various ends. Others of them, though, claim they are no different from our Lord Jesus Christ.[9] (11) For their souls are from the same carousel,[10] similarly to Jesus' soul have shown contempt for everything, <and will go to the same place>. <In fact>, they say, all souls have been vouchsafed the same power that Jesus' soul has. And thus, they say, they too progress through all activity, as Jesus' soul has of course gone through it. Again, if indeed one can despise more thoroughly than Jesus, he will be better than he.[11]

---

[6] For the carousel see Plato *Phaedrus* 347B-D, 348.

[7] Cf. Test. Tr. 29,26-27: the defilement of the Law is manifest.

[8] Holl: καταργῆσαι; Text: πρᾶξαι

[9] Cf. Tert. De Anima 23.

[10] Cf. Apocry. Jas. 10,34-38; Gos. Tr. 41,3-7; Nat. Arc. 96,19-22; GT 49; 50; Man. Keph. 63,14-15; the Mandaean *Ginza* 176,38-177,2 and *passim*.

[11] For equality with or superiority to Jesus, cf. Apocry. Jas. 4,32-5,3; 5,13; 6, 9-21. The Apocry. Jas passages, however, probably refer to martyrdom.

3,1[12] The members of this unlawful school put all sorts of horrid, pernicious deeds into practice. They have thought up magic devices and invented various incantations—love charms and spells—for every purpose. What is more, they summon familiar spirits too, in order to <gain> great power over everyone with the aid of much magic <so that>, they say, each of them can be master of anyone he wishes, and in any activity he may venture to undertake. (2) They deceive themselves in this way in order, if you please, to convince their blinded minds that the <souls> which have undertaken such things, have prevailed through acts of this sort, and have despised the angels who made the world and the things that are in the world, can escape the jurisdiction of these angelic fabricators—I don't care to say, "creators"—to embrace the freedom on high and attain the flight aloft.[13]

3,3[14] But they have been prepared by Satan, and put forward as a reproach and stumbling-block for God's church. For they have adopted the name of "Christian," though Satan has arranged this so that the heathen will be scandalized by them and reject the benefit of God's holy church and its real message, because of their wickedness and their intolerable evil deeds—(4) so that the heathen, observing the continual behavior of the evildoers themselves and supposing that the members of God's holy church are of the same kind, will refuse the hearing of God's real teaching, as I said, or even, seeing certain (of us) <behave in this profane way>, blaspheme us all alike. (5) And so, wherever they see such people, most of the heathen will not come near us for conversation or an exchange of views, or to listen to sacred discourse, and will not give us a hearing, since they are frightened by the unholy deeds of the wicked people.

4,1[15] These people spend all their time in dissipation, and in doing everything possible for their bodily comfort, and they never come near us, except perhaps to catch wavering souls with their wrong teaching. They resemble us only in proudly giving themselves a name—in order, through that name, to obtain the cover for their own wickedness.

4,2 But in the words of scripture, "Their damnation is just,"[16] as the holy apostle Paul said. Because of their evil deeds the due return will be awarded them. (3) By recklessly giving their minds to frenzy they have surrendered themselves to the sensations of countless pleasures. For they say that such

[12] With the following paragraph cf. Iren. 1.25.3 and Hipp. Refut. 7.32.5.
[13] Cf. Corp. Herm I.32.
[14] With the next paragraph cf. Iren. 1.25.2-3.
[15] See Iren. 1.25.3.
[16] Rom 3:8

things as men consider evil are not evil but good by nature[17]—nothing is evil by nature—but are regarded as evil by men. (4) And if one does all these things in this one incarnation the soul will not be embodied again to be cast down once more. By performing every action in one round it will escape, freed and with no more debt of activity in the world.

4,5 Again, I am afraid to say what sort of actions, or I might uncover a trench like a hidden sewer, and some might think that I am causing the blast of foul odor. Still, since I am constrained by the truth to disclose what goes on among the deluded, I am going to make myself speak—with some delicacy and yet without overstepping the bounds of the truth. (6) The plain fact is that these people perform every unspeakable, unlawful thing, which is not right even to say, and every kind of homosexual union and carnal intercourse with women, with every member of the body[18]—(7) and that they perform magic, sorcery and idolatry and say that this is the discharge of their obligations in the body, so that they will not be charged any more or required to do anything else, and for this reason the soul will not be turned back after its departure and go on to another incarnation and transmigration.

5,1[19] Their literature is such that the intelligent reader will be astounded and shocked, and doubt that human beings can do such things—not only civilized people like ourselves, but even those who <live with> wild beasts and bestial, brutish men, and all but venture to behave like dogs and swine. (2) For they say they absolutely must make every use of these things, or their souls may depart shy some work, and so be returned to bodies, to do all over again what they have not done. (3) And this, they say, is what Jesus in the Gospel meant by the parable, "Agree with thine adversary whiles thou art in the way with him, and do thy diligence to be quit of him, lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and the officer cast thee into prison. Verily I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means come out thence till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing."[20]

5,4 But they make up a story to explain this parable and says that the "adversary" in it is one of the angels who have made the world and has

---

[17] The distinction between conventional "good" and "evil" is deprecated at Gos. Phil. 53,14-20; 66,9,13.

[18] Epiph may have deduced this from Iren. 1.25.4:…uti et omnia quecumque sunt irreligiosa et impia in potestate habere et operari si dicant.

[19] With 5,1-3 cf. Iren. 1.25.4.

[20] Matt 5:25-26. For Gnostic uses of this verse see Test. Tr. 30,15-17; PS 3.113 (MacDermot, pp. 294-296).

been appointed for this very purpose—to bring the souls to the judge when they quit their bodies here and are put on trial there. And if they have not done every act they are given by the archon to the "officer." (5) The officer is an angel whose service to the judge who made the world is to bring the souls back and bottle them up in different bodies.[21] And they identify the "adversary," whom I said the Lord has mentioned in the Gospel, as one of the angels who made the world, with the name of "Devil."[22]

5,6[23] For they say that the "prison" is the body, and would have it that the "uttermost farthing"is reembodiment. <Now> (the soul) <must> accomplish its "last act" in every incarnation, and not be left behind any more to do some wicked thing. For they say, as I have indicated, that when it has progressed through them all, performed them one by one and been liberated, it must ascend to the Unknowable One on high, passing the world's makers and maker by. (7) Again, they say that after they have done them all, even if in one incarnation, souls must then be freed and go to the heights afterwards. But if they do not do them in one, they work gradually through the performance of every unlawful deed in each incarnation, and are then freed.[24] (8) Again, they say, "We deign to tell this to those who are worthy,[25] that they may do the things that seem to be evil although they are not evil by nature, so that they may learn this and be freed." (9) And this school of Carpocrates marks the right ear-lobes of the persons they deceive with a burning iron,[26] or by using a razor or needle.

6,1 I heard at some time of a Marcellina[27] who was deceived by them, who corrupted many people in the time of Anicetus, Bishop of Rome, the successor of Pius and the bishops before him. (2)[28] For the bishops at Rome were, first, Peter and Paul, the apostles themselves and also bishops—then Linus, then Cletus, then Clement, a contemporary of Peter and Paul whom Paul mentions in the Epistle to the Romans. And no one need wonder why others before him succeeded the apostles in the episcopate, even though he was contemporary with Peter and Paul—for he too is the apostles' contemporary. (4) I am not quite clear as to whether he received the episcopal

---

[21] A NHC example of punishment by reincarnation is found at Apoc. Paul 21,19-21.
[22] I.e.: accuser
[23] With 6-7 cf. Hipp. Refut. 7.32.7; Iren. 1.25.4.
[24] Cf. Hipp. Refut. 7.32.7.
[25] Iren. 1.25.5: Jesum dicentes…illos expostulasse, ut dignis et adsentientibus seorsum haec traderent.
[26] Cf. Iren. 1.25.6; Hipp. Refut. 7.32.8.
[27] Iren. 1.25.6
[28] Cf. Iren. 3.3.3; Eus. H. E. 5.6.1-2.

appointment from Peter while they were still alive, and he declined and would not exercise the office—for in one of his Epistles he says, giving this counsel to someone, "I withdraw, I depart, let the people of God be tranquil,"[29] (I have found this in certain historical works)—or whether he was appointed by the bishop Cletus after the apostles' death.

6,5 But even so, others could have been made bishop while the apostles, I mean Peter and Paul, were still alive, since they often journeyed abroad for the proclamation of Christ, but Rome could not be without a bishop. (6) Paul even reached Spain, and Peter often visited Pontus and Bithynia. But after Clement had been appointed and declined, if this is what happened—I suspect this but cannot say it for certain—he could have been compelled to hold the episcopate in his turn, after the deaths of Linus and Cletus who were bishops for twelve years each after the death of Saints Peter and Paul in the twelfth year of Nero.)

6,7 In any case, the succession of the bishops at Rome runs in this order: Peter and Paul, Linus and Cletus, Clement, Evaristus, Alexander, Xystus, Telesphorus, Hyginus, Pius, and Anicetus, whom I mentioned above, on the list.[30] And no one need be surprised at my listing each of the items so exactly; precise information is always given in this way. (8) In Anicetus' time then, as I said, the Marcellina I have spoken of appeared at Rome spewing forth the corruption of Carpocrates' teaching, and corrupted and destroyed many there. And that made a beginning of the so-called Gnostics.

6,9[31] They have images painted with colors—some, moreover, have images made of gold, silver and other material—which they say are portraits of Jesus, and made by Pontius Pilate! That is, the portraits of the actual Jesus while he was dwelling among men! (10) They possess images like these in secret, and of certain philosophers besides—Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, and the rest—and they also place other portraits of Jesus with these philosophers. And after setting them up they worship them and celebrate heathen mysteries. For once they have erected these images, they go on to follow the customs of the heathen. But what are <the> customs of the heathen but sacrifices and the rest? (11) They say that salvation is of the soul only, and not of bodies.

7,1 And so we are bound to refute these people with all our might; no one should despise argumentation, most of all against cheats! But someone might say, "Aren't these things that are easy to spot, and foolish through

[29] 1 Clem. 54.1
[30] 6,1 gives a sort of list. Pourkier renders: en tête de la liste.
[31] Cf. Iren. 1.25.6.

and through?" Yes, but even foolish things have a way of convincing the foolish and subverting the wise, if no mind trained in the truth is there. Now since Carpocrates too has fallen into the magic of Simon and the rest, I am also going to refute him with the same arguments.

7,2 For if the unknowable, unnameable power was the cause of other angels, either there is ignorance in it—that is, in the Father of all—if he did not know what the angels he was making would do, not realizing that they would rebel and create things he did not want created. Or else he made them knowing that they were going to make things, but something he did not want got made by them—and by knowledge and consent he must be the maker of the things they have dared to make. (3) Now if, as I said, he knew what they would make but didn't want them to, why would he make the makers, to do what he didn't want done?

7,4 But if he has made the angels himself so that they would make what they have, then he wanted it made—that is why he prepared the angelic makers beforehand. And if he prepared them beforehand to create, but forbids what they created, this would be blatant false prosecution. (5) If, however, he consented to their creating, but chooses to repossess their creation—meaning men and souls—against their wishes, this will be just plain greed and nothing else—if the men the angels <made> are seized by the One on high, against the angels' wishes. Furthermore it must be weakness since, not being able to create for himself, he seizes his creatures' creations.

7,6 And for the rest it's a yarn and nonsense—with the ones below able to rise above the ones in the middle, and the ones in the middle being punished for being the causes of the ones below—and the ones below, I mean the souls of the ones in this creation, being brought safely past the ones in the middle to the One above, and set free. And the One above, who cannot create, must be adjudged feeble, but his creatures must be adjudged <powerful>, since they could make the things he did not want made, or wanted to make but couldn't.

7,7 For what he desires cannot be bad for him or be produced by beings which are bad. If it were bad, it should perish. But if any part of the work is preserved, the work cannot be bad—even if (only) part of it is going to be preserved. Nor can its makers be bad, <the ones who> executed the part that is going to be preserved. (8) And if the soul does come from angels, and receives power from on high after being brought into being, then all the more will angels attain salvation—since the soul they produced is saved although it comes from bad beings! And if it is saved, then neither the soul itself which was made by the angels, nor the angels whose product

the soul is, can be bad. (8,1) But anyone in his right mind must know that this whole cheap piece of work is a product of insanity.

8,2 But these people will be shamed again, from their other words as well. For if Jesus is not the offspring of a virgin, Mary, but of Joseph's seed and the same Mary, and yet Jesus is saved, then the persons whose offspring he is will also be saved. And if Mary and Joseph are of the demiurge, then they have said that the demiurge is <also> the creator <of Jesus>; and the maker of Mary and Joseph, by whose agency Jesus has come from the unknowable Father on high, cannot be defective.[32] (3) But if Jesus too is the product of the angels, and the demiurge is one of the angels, then they will surely all fall foul of the same sort of absurdity that the angels have. And there can be no proof of their dramatic piece, which is full of poison, and crammed with every kind of virulent teaching.

8,4 But since we have beaten this sect back once more—like splitting a serpent's head with a cudgel of faith and truth when it is (already lying) on the ground—let us approach the other beast-like sects <that have appeared in the world> for its ruin and because of our promise force ourselves to begin <their refutation>.

28.
Against Cerinthians[1] *or Merinthians, Number eight, but twenty-eight of the series*

1,1 Now Cerinthus in turn, the founder of the so-called Cerinthians, has come from this bestial seed, bringing the world his venom. But almost nothing different from Carpocrates is spouting out into the world, just the same harmful poisons.

1,2[2] For he slanderously gives the same account of Christ as Carpocrates, that he was born of Mary and Joseph's seed, and likewise that the world was made by angels.[3] (3) In the inculcation of his teaching he

---

[32] ἐν ὑστερήματι. Pourkier: ce n'est plus dans l'Avorton qui'il faudra chercher celui qui a fait Joseph et Marie.

[1] The source of the information in the opening portions of this Sect is Irenaeus, upon whom Hipp. Synt. seems to be dependent. The very short summary notice at PsT 3.2 might be drawn from Hipp. Synt. Filaster may have used Hipp. Synt., Epiph or both. Either by conjecture or from oral tradition, Epiph makes Cerinthus, who he believes taught the necessity of circumcision, the instigator of the controversies about circumcision which the NT records in Acts, 1 Corinthians and Galatians.

[2] With 1,2-7 cf. Iren. I.26.1; Hipp Refut. 7.33; PsT 3.2.

[3] With 28,3 cf. PsT 3.2; Fil. 36.1.

differs from Carpocrates in no way except only in this, that he adhered in part to Judaism. He, however, claims that the Law and prophets have been given by the angels, and the law-giver is one of the angels who have made the world.

1,4 Cerinthus lived in Asia and began his preaching there. (5) I have already said of him that he too preached that the world was not created by the first, supreme power—and that when "Jesus," the offspring of Mary and the seed of Joseph, had grown up, "Christ," meaning the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove, came down to him in the Jordan[4] from the God on high, revealing the unknowable Father to him, and through him to his companions.

1,6 And therefore, because a power had come to him from on high, he performed works of power.[5] And when he suffered, the thing that had come from above flew away from Jesus to the heights.[6] (7) Jesus has suffered and risen again but the Christ who had come to him from above flew away without suffering[7]—that is, the thing which had descended in the form of a dove—and Jesus is not Christ.

2,1 But he too has come to grief, as all you lovers of the truth can see. He claims that the law-giver is not good, but he sees fit to be obedient to his Law—plainly, as to a good one. (2) How can the evil one have given the good Law? If it is good not to commit adultery and good not to murder, how much more must the giver of these commandments be better—if it be granted that the person who does not do these things is good! And how can someone who advises what is good, and gives a good Law, be accused of doing evil? The man who takes this sort of line is crazy!

2,3 Now this man is one of the ones who caused the trouble in the apostles' time,[8] when James wrote the letter to Antioch and said, "We know that certain which went out from us have come unto you and troubled you with words, to whom we gave no such commandment."[9] (4) He is also one of those who opposed St. Peter because he had gone to St. Cornelius when

---

[4] So at PS 2.63 (MacDermot p. 129). The idea is also found at Apoc. Adam 76,28-77,3; 77,16-18; Gr. Seth 51,20-24; Tri. Prot. 50, 12-15; Test. Tr. 30,18-28. At Tri. Trac. 125,5-9 "the Word" descends upon Jesus.

[5] Iren. 26.1: et tunc…virtutes perfecisse. And so at Hipp. Refut. 33.2.

[6] Cf. Apoc. Adam 77,9-18; Tri. Prot. 50,12-15.

[7] Cf. 1 Apoc. Jas. 31,17-22, "I am he who was within me. Never have I suffered in any way, nor have I been distressed, and this people has done me no harm" and cf. Cod. Tch. James 18,6-11. See also Apoc. Adam 77,9-18; G. Seth 55,14-56,14; Apoc. Pet. 81,7-83,8.

[8] Cf. Fil. 36.4-5: Hic sub apostolis beatis quaestionem seditionis commovit, dicens debere circumcidi homines, etc.

[9] Acts 15:24

Cornelius had been vouchsafed a vision of an angel and had sent for Peter. And Peter was dubious and saw the vision of the sheet and the things that were in it, and was told by the Lord to call nothing common or unclean. (5) And so Cerinthus stirred the circumcised multitudes up over Peter on his return to Jerusalem by saying, "He went in to men uncircumcised."[10] (6) Cerinthus did this before preaching his doctrine in Asia and falling into the deeper pit of his destruction. For, because he was circumcised himself he sought an excuse, through circumcision if you please, for his opposition to the uncircumcised believers.[11]

3,1 But because the Lord unfailingly cares for mankind, safeguards the clarity of the truth in the sons of the truth, and has granted the holy apostle Peter to give the refutation of Cerinthus and his party, the stupidity of Cerinthus becomes evident. (2) St. Peter said, "I was in the city of Joppa, and at midday, about the sixth hour, I saw a sheet let down, knit at the four corners, wherein were all manner of four-footed beasts and creeping things. And he said unto me, Slay and eat. And I said, Not so, Lord; for nothing common or unclean hath at any time entered into my mouth. But the voice answered me again from heaven, What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common. And, behold, immediately there were two men already come unto the house, and the Spirit said unto me, Go with them, nothing doubting."[12]

3,3 And then he explained how this had been said to him as a parable and how he had been doubtful at the time, till the Lord showed him plainly the things he was teaching him through the words and images. (4) For the instant he opened his mouth when he had come to Caesarea, the Holy Spirit fell upon Cornelius. And seeing this, Peter said, "Can any man forbid water to these, which have been counted worthy to receive the Holy Ghost as we were at the beginning?" (5) But all this was a mystery and an act of God's lovingkindness, so that St. Peter and everyone else would realize that the salvation of the gentiles is not of man but of God. God had granted the gift of the Holy Spirit, the vision of the angel, and the acceptance of Cornelius' prayer, fasting and alms, beforehand, so that the apostles—St. Peter especially, and the other apostles—would deprive no one truly called by God of that with which they had been entrusted.

---

[10] Acts 11:4-12

[11] Or, with Klijn and Rinnick: He did everything to propagate circumcision, ostensibly because the believers among the gentiles offered opposition against it, but in reality because he was circumcised himself.

[12] Acts 10:47

4,1 But these doings took place then at the instigation of that false apostle Cerinthus. Another time too, he and his friends caused a discord at Jerusalem itself, when Paul arrived with Titus, and Cerinthus said, "He hath brought in men uncircumcised with him"—speaking now of Titus—"and polluted the holy place."[13] (2) And so Paul says, "But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised. But because of the false brethren, unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ, to whom we gave place by subjection not even temporarily."[14] And he used to command the uncircumcised, "Be not circumcised. For if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing."[15] (3) Circumcision was a temporary expedient until the greater circumcision arrived, that is, the laver of regeneration—as is plain to everyone, and is shown more clearly by the things the apostles said, especially the holy apostle Paul. For he insists, "To them we gave place by subjection, not even temporarily."[16]

4,4 But to anyone who is willing to observe what the apostles went through at that time, it is amazing how the things a spirit of imposture inspired this faction to do betray the character of those who caused the commotion among the apostles with their heresies. (5) For, as I have said, no slight disturbance arose then, after they had rebelled, become false apostles, <and> sent other false apostles—first to Antioch, as I have said already, and to other places—to say, "Except ye be circumcised and keep the Law of Moses, ye cannot be saved."[17] (6) And these are the ones the apostle Paul calls "false apostles, deceitful workers, disguising themselves as apostles of Christ."[18]

5,1 For[19] they use the Gospel according to Matthew—in part and not in its entirety, but they do use it for the sake of the physical genealogy[20]—and they cite the following as a proof-text, arguing from the Gospel, "'It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master.'[21] (2) What does this mean?" they say, "Christ was circumcised; be circumcised yourself![22] Christ lived by

---

[13] Cf. Acts 21:28.
[14] Gal 2:5
[15] Gal 5:2
[16] Gal. 2:3-5
[17] Acts 15:1
[18] 2Cor ll:13
[19] I.e., their use of Matthew shows that they are masquerading as apostles.
[20] Cf. Fil. 36.3. Iren. 1.26.2 says this of the Ebionites; however, Cerinthus is mentioned in the same passage.
[21] Matt 10:25
[22] Cf. Fil. 36.2: Docet autem circumcidi et sabbatizari.

the Law; you too do the same." And therefore some of them are convinced by those specious arguments as though overcome by deadly drugs, because of the circumcision of Christ. (3) They discount Paul, however, because he did not obey the circumcised.[23] Moreover they reject him for saying, "Whosoever of you are justified by the Law, ye are fallen from grace,"[24] and, "If ye be circumcised, Christ will profit you nothing."[25]

6,1 In turn this Cerinthus, fool and teacher of fools that he is, ventures to maintain that Christ has suffered and been crucified but has not risen yet,[26] but he will rise when the general resurrection of the dead comes. (2) Now this position of theirs is untenable, both the words and the ideas. And so, in astonishment at those who did not believe in the coming resurrection of the dead, the apostle said, "If the dead rise not, then is Christ not raised;[27] "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die"[28] and, "Be not deceived; evil communications corrupt good manners."[29] (3) Again, he likewise gives their refutation to those who say that Christ is not risen yet by saying, "If Christ be not raised, our preaching is vain and our faith is vain. And we also are found false witnesses against God, <because we testified against God> that he raised up Christ, if so be that he raised him not up."[30] <For in Corinth too certain persons arose to say there is no resurrection of the dead>, as though it was apostolic preaching that Christ was not risen <yet> and the dead are not raised (at all).

6,4 For their school reached its height in this country, I mean Asia, and in Galatia as well. And in these countries I also heard of a tradition which said that when some of their people died too soon, without baptism, others would be baptized for them in their names, so that they would not be punished for rising unbaptized at the resurrection and become the subjects of the authority that made the world. (5) And the tradition I heard of says that this is why the same holy apostle said, "If the dead rise not at all, why are they baptized for them?"[31] But others explain the text satisfactorily by saying that, as long as they are catechumens, the dying are allowed baptism before they die because of this hope, showing that the

---

[23] Iren. 1.26.2
[24] Gal 5:4
[25] Gal 5:2
[26] So at Fil. 36.2
[27] 1 Cor 15:16
[28] 1 Cor 15:32
[29] 1 Cor 15:33
[30] 1 Cor 15:14-15
[31] 1 Cor 15:29

person who has died will also rise, and therefore needs the forgiveness of his sins through baptism.

6,6 Some of these people have preached that Christ is not risen yet, but will rise together with everyone; others, that the dead will not rise at all.[32] (7) Hence the apostle has come forward and given the refutation of both these groups and the rest of the sects at once on <the subject of resurrection>. And in the testimonies that he gave in full he produced the sure proof of the resurrection, salvation and hope of the dead (8) by saying, "This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality,"[33] and again, "Christ is risen, the firstfruits of them that slept."[34] This was to refute both kinds of sects at once and truly impart the unsullied doctrine of his teaching to anyone who wanted to know God's truth and saving doctrine.

7,1 Hence it can be observed at every point that Cerinthus, with his supporters, is pathetically mistaken and has become responsible for the ruin of others, since the sacred scriptures explain it all to us, clearly and in detail. (2) For neither is Christ the product of Joseph's seed—for how could the "product" be a sign and, further, how will be words of Isaiah be upheld, "Behold, the Virgin shall conceive, and bear a son,"[35] and so on? (3) Further, how can the holy Virgin's words to Gabriel, "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?" be fulfilled—and his answer, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee,"[36] and so on? (4) And once more, how can their stupidity not be exposed when the Gospel plainly says, "Before they came together she was found with child?"[37]

7,5 But that they did not come together at all is plain to see. Heaven preserve us from saying so! Otherwise, he would not have made provision to entrust her to the holy virgin John after the crucifixion, as he says, "Behold thy mother"—and to her, "Behold thy son."[38] (6) He should have entrusted her to her relatives, or to Joseph's sons, if they were his sons by her—I mean James, Joses, Jude and Simon, Joseph's sons by another wife. Joseph had no relations with the Virgin, heaven forbid—after childbearing the Virgin is found inviolate. (7) However, these things have already

---

[32] Cf. Acts of Paul 8.1.12 (H-S II p. 254).
[33] 1 Cor 15:33
[34] 1 Cor 15:20
[35] Isa. 7:14
[36] Luke 1:34-35
[37] Matt 1:18
[38] John 19:26-27

been plainly dealt with in another work of mine, and are going to be dealt with (again).[39] Here I have said something about this subject as though in passing so that, when my intent is to effect the cure of other bites and <prepare> a remedy and preventative for other poisons, I will not divert the reader to different ones. (8) In any case, to a person of understanding their ridiculous teaching will be proved worthless in every way—refuted by the apostles, despised by the wise, and rejected by God and his proclamation of the truth.

8,1 But they are called Merinthians too, I am told. Whether the same Cerinthus was also called Merinthus I have no idea; or whether there was someone else named Merinthus, a colleague of his, God knows! (2) I have already said that not only he himself at Jerusalem often opposed the apostles; but his supporters did it, and in Asia. But it makes no difference whether it was he or whether it was another colleague who supported him, whose views were similar, and who acted with him for the same ends. The whole perversity of their teaching is of this sort and they are called both Cerinthians and Merinthians.

8,3 And having gone through all this about this horrid, snake-like wickedness, we again move on to the next, giving thanks that we have crossed the sea of these evil doctrines unharmed—and praying that when we encounter the rest, as though we were venturing into rough, beast-infested shallows, we will not be harmed but reach the safe haven of the truth, which I shall sketch by contrasting it with the nonsense which is talked about it.

8,4 For to anyone who wishes to examine and describe the forms (of these sects), this one too will truly seem like a snake with two heads because of its dual nomenclature—and like the viper called the "rot viper." Its whole body is covered with long red hair, but it has neither the nature nor the hide of a goat or sheep but those of a snake, and with its bite it does the harm a snake does to those who happen on it. (5) For it ruins its adherents, sometimes by destroying the New Testament's teachings with material from the old religion, and sometimes by circulating their false charges against the apostles who had come from circumcision to faith in Christ, with lying words as though from the New Testament. But having struck and thrashed its rot, poison and fangs with the cudgel of the truth let us hurry on, as I said, by the power of God, to go through the rest.

---

[39] Ancoratus 60,1; Pan. 78,7f

29.

Against Nazoraeans.[1] *Number nine, but twenty-nine of the series*

1,1 Next after these come the Nazoraeans, at the same time as they or even before them—either together with them or after them, in any case their contemporaries. I cannot say more precisely who succeeded whom. For, as I said, these were contemporary with each other, and had ideas similar to each other's.

1,2 For these people did not give themselves the name of Christ[2] or Jesus' own name, but that of "Nazoraeans." (3) But at that time all Christians alike were called Nazoraeans. They also came to be called "Jessaeans"[3] for a short while, before the disciples began to be called Christians at Antioch. (4) But they were called Jessaeans because of Jesse, I suppose, since David was descended from Jesse and Mary was a lineal descendant of David. This was in fulfillment of sacred scripture, since in the Old Testament the Lord tells David, "Of the fruit of thy belly shall I set upon thy throne."

2,1 I am afraid of <drawing the treatment> of every expression <out too long and so>, though the truth moves me to touch on the considerations for contemplation in every expression, I give this note <in> brief, not to go to great length <in giving the explanation>. (2) Since the Lord said to David, "Of the fruit of thy belly shall I set upon the throne," and, "The Lord sware unto David and will not repent,"[4] it is plain that God's promise is irrevocable. (3) In the first place, what does God have to swear by but "By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord?"[5]—for "God hath no oath by a greater."[6] The divine does not swear, however, but the statement has the function of providing confirmation.

For the Lord swore to David with an oath that he would set the fruit of his belly upon his throne. (4) And the apostles bear witness that Christ had to be born of David's seed, as our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ indeed was. I shall pass over the vast number of testimonies, in order, as I said, not to drag the discussion out to great length.

---

[1] See p. 47 n. 27. This Sect seems to be based on Epiph's personal knowledge, though he has conjectured its history from passages in scripture and Eusebius.

[2] Eusebius, at H. E. 2.17.4 says that the first Christians were not everywhere known as such.

[3] Epiphanius bases this on his memory of the term Ἐσσαῖοι, which Philo uses at Vita Contemplativa 1 for the group Eusebius calls Therapeutae. On the subject see Pourkier p. 113.

[4] Ps 109:4

[5] Gen 22:16

[6] Cf. Heb 6:13.

2,5 But probably someone might say, "Since Christ was physically born of David's seed, that is, of the Holy Virgin Mary, why is he not sitting on David's throne? For the Gospel says, 'They came that they might anoint him king, and when Jesus perceived this he departed…and hid himself in Ephraim, a city of the wilderness.'"[7] (6) But now that I have gotten to this passage and am asked about this text and the reason why the prophecy about sitting on David's throne has not been fulfilled physically in the Savior's case—for some have thought that it has not—I shall still say that it is a fact. No word of God's holy scripture comes to nothing.

3,1 For David's throne and kingly seat is the priesthood in the holy church. The Lord has combined this kingly and high priestly rank and conferred it on his holy church by transferring David's throne to it, never to fail. (2) In time past David's throne continued by succession until Christ himself, since the rulers from Judah did not fail until he came "for whom are the things prepared, and he is the expectation of the nations,"[8] <as> scripture says.

3,3 For the rulers in succession from Judah came to an end with Christ's arrival. Until he came <the> rulers <were anointed priests>,[9] but after his birth in Bethlehem of Judaea the order ended and was altered[10] in the time of Alexander, a ruler of priestly and kingly stock. (4) This position died out with this Alexander from the time of Salina also known as Alexandra, in the time of King Herod and the Roman emperor Augustus. (Though this Alexander was crowned also, as one of the anointed priests and rulers.[11] (5) For when the two tribes, the kingly and priestly, were united—I mean the tribe of Judah with Aaron and the whole tribe of Levi—kings also became priests, for nothing hinted at in holy scripture can be wrong.)[12] (6) But then finally a gentile, King Herod, was crowned, and not David's descendants any more.

3,7 But with the transfer of the royal throne the rank of king passed, in Christ, from the physical house of David and Israel to the church.[13] The

---

[7] Cf. John 6:15; 11:54.

[8] Gen 49:10

[9] Cf. Jer. Chron. 160,16-17 (Helm).

[10] Cf. Eus. Chron. 61,12-14 (Karst); Jer. Chron. 148,6-8 (Helm). Eusebius' Chronicle might be the source of Epiphanius' explanation.

[11] Another version of this is found at Jer. Chron. 148,11-14 (Helm).

[12] This might have come from Orig. Hom. in Sam. Frgt. 4 (Klostermann, *SC* 3, p. 296) καταγνοὺς οὖν τοῦ Σαοὺλ καὶ βουλόμενος τῷ Δαυὶδ τὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ φυλᾶξαι τὴν βασιλείαν διὰ τὸν ἐξ αὐτοῦ τεχθησόμενον κατὰ σάρκα βασιλέα τῆς κτίσεως ἁπάσης

[13] The substance of this argument appears at a Justin Apol. 32.1-3; Dial. 11.4; 52.2-4; 120.3-5; 126.1; Iren. 4.10.2; Eus. H. E. 1.6.1-2; 4; 8; Demonstratio 7.

throne is established in God's holy church forever, and has both the kingly and the high-priestly rank for two reasons. (8) It has the kingly rank from our Lord Jesus Christ, in two ways: because he is physically descended from King David, and because he is in fact a greater king from all eternity in virtue of his Godhead. But it has the priestly rank because Christ himself is high priest and the founder of the office[14] of the high priests (9) since James, who was called the Lord's brother and who was his apostle, was immediately[15] made the first bishop.[16] He was Joseph's son by birth, but was ranked as the Lord's brother because of their upbringing together.

4,1 For this James was Joseph's son by Joseph's <first> wife,[17] not by Mary, as I have said in many other places[18] and dealt with more clearly for you. (2) And moreover I find that he was of Davidic descent because of being Joseph's son, <and> that he was born a nazirite—for he was Joseph's first-born, and (thus) consecrated.[19] And I have found further that he also functioned as (high)-priest in the ancient priesthood.[20] (3) Thus he was permitted to enter the Holy of Holies once a year, as scripture says the Law directed the high priests to do. For many before me—Eusebius, Clement and others—have reported this of him. (4) He was allowed to wear the priestly tablet[21] besides, as the trustworthy authors I mentioned have testified in those same historical writings.

4,5 Now our Lord Jesus Christ, as I said, is "priest forever after the order of Melchizedek,"[22] and at the same time hereditary king, so that he may transfer the priesthood along with the lawgiving. (6) And since David's seed, through Mary, is seated on the throne, <his throne endures> forever and of his kingdom there shall be no end. He should now transfer the order of the former kingship; for indeed his kingdom is not earthly, as he said to Pontius Pilate in the Gospel, "My Kingdom is not of this world."[23] (7) For since Christ brings to fulfillment[24] all the things (that have been said) in riddles, the preliminaries have reached a limit.

---

[14] πρύτανις
[15] Eus. H. E. 2.1-2
[16] I.e., thus confirming the fact that Christ was πρύτανις of high priests
[17] Cf. Jer. Vir. Ill. 2. Jerome believes he was the son of "Mary, the sister of the Lord's mother" (Richardson p. 7).
[18] For example at Ancoratus 60,1 ff
[19] Eus. H. E. 2.23.5
[20] Eus. H. E. 2.23
[21] This is said of John at Eus. H. E. 3.31.3.
[22] Heb 5:6
[23] John 18:36
[24] I.e., Heb 3:5

For he who is always king did not come to achieve sovereignty. He granted the crown to those whom he appointed—lest it be thought that he advanced from a lower estate to a higher. (8) For his throne endures, of his kingdom there shall be no end, and he is seated on the throne of David and has transferred David's kingship and granted it, together with the high priesthood, to his own servants, the high priests of the catholic church.

4,9 And there is much to say about this. But in any case, since I have come to the topic of the reason why those who had come to faith in Christ were called Jessaeans before they were called Christians, we said that Jesse was the father of David. And they had been named Jessaeans, either because of this Jesse; or from the name or our Lord Jesus since, being his disciples, they were derived from Jesus; or because of the etymology of the Lord's name. For in Hebrew Jesus means "healer" or "physician,"[25] and "savior." (10) In any case, they had got this name before they were called Christians. But at Antioch, as I have mentioned before and as is the essence of the truth, the disciples and the whole church of God began to be called Christians.

5,1[26] If you enjoy study and have read the passage about them in Philo's historical writings, in his book entitled "Jessaeans," you can find that, in giving his account of their way of life and their hymns and describing their monasteries in the vicinity of the Marean marsh, Philo described none other than Christians.[27] (2) For when he visited the area—the place is called Mareotis—and was entertained by them at their monasteries in the region, he was edified. (3) He arrived there during Passover and observed their customs, and how some of them put off (eating) throughout the holy week of Passover, though others ate every other day and others, indeed, each evening.[28] But all this has been written by Philo on the subject of the Christians' faith and regimen.

5,4 So when they were called Jessaeans then shortly after the Savior's ascension and after Mark had preached in Egypt,[29] in those times certain other persons, supposed followers of the apostles, seceded in their turn. I mean the Nazoraeans, whom I am discussing here. They were Jewish, were attached to the Law, and had circumcision. (5) But it was as though people

---

[25] "Healer" or "physician" might be what Epiph, with his knowledge of Hebrew and Aramaic, makes of θεραπευταί. See below and cf. Eus. H. E. 2.17.3 ἤτοι παρὰ τὸ τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν προσιόντων αὐτοῖς τῶν ἀπὸ κακίας παθῶν ἰατρῶν δίκην…θεραπεύειν.

[26] 5,1-2 is based on Eus. H. E. 2.17.1-24.

[27] Epiph here conflates Eus. H. E. 2.17.16-17 with 2.17.21-22.

[28] Eus. H. E. 2.17.8

[29] See Eus. H. E. 16.1-17.1.

had seen fire under a misapprehension. Not understanding why, or for <what> use, the persons who had kindled this fire were doing it—either to cook their rations with the fire, or burn some dead trees and brush, which are usually destroyed by fire—they kindled fire too, in imitation, and set themselves ablaze.

5,6 For by hearing just Jesus' name, and seeing the miracles performed by the hands of the apostles, they came to faith in Jesus themselves. And since they found that he had been conceived at Nazareth and brought up in Joseph's home, and for this reason is called "Jesus the Nazoraean" in the Gospel—as the apostles say, "Jesus the Nazoraean, a man approved by signs and wonders,"[30] and so on—they adopted this name, so as to be called Nazoreans.

5,7 Not "nazirites"—that means "consecrated persons." Anciently this rank belonged to firstborn sons and men who had been dedicated to God. Samson was one, and others after him, and many before him. Moreover, John the Baptist too was one of these same persons who were consecrated to God, for "He drank neither wine nor strong drink."[31] (This regimen, an appropriate one for their rank, was prescribed for such persons.) (6,1) They did not call themselves Nasaraeans either; the sect of Nasaraeans was before Christ and did not know Christ.

6,2 But besides, as I have indicated, everyone called the Christians Nazoraeans, as they say in accusing Paul the apostle, "We have found this man a pestilent fellow and a perverter of the people, a ring-leader of the sect of the Nazoraeans."[32] (3) And the holy apostle did not disclaim the name—not to profess these people's heresy, but he was glad to own the name his adversaries' malice had applied to him for Christ's sake. (4) For he says in court, "They neither found me in the temple disputing with any man, neither raising up the people, nor have I done any of those things whereof they accuse me. But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I, believing all things in the Law and the prophets."[33]

6,5 And no wonder the apostle admitted to being a Nazoraean! In those days everyone called Christians this because of the city of Nazareth—there was no other usage of the name at the time. And so people gave the name of <"Nazoraeans"> to believers in Christ, of whom it is written, "because

[30] Acts 2:22
[31] Luke 1:15
[32] Acts 24:5
[33] Acts 24:12-14

he shall be called a Nazoraean."[34] (6) Even today in fact, people call all the sects, I mean Manichaeans, Marcionites, Gnostics and others, by the common name of "Christians," though they are not Christians. However, although each sect has another name, it still allows this one with pleasure, since the name is an ornament to it. For they think they can preen themselves on Christ's name—certainly not on Christ's faith and works!

6,7 Thus Christ's holy disciples too called themselves "disciples of Jesus" then, as indeed they were. But when others called them Nazoraeans they did not reject it, being aware of the intent of those who were calling them that. They were calling them Nazoraeans because of Christ, since our Lord Jesus was called "<the> Nazoraean" himself—as the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles say—(8) because of his upbringing in the city of Nazareth (now a village) in Joseph's home, after having been born in the flesh at Bethlehem, of the ever-virgin Mary, Joseph's betrothed. For Joseph had settled in Nazareth after leaving Bethlehem and taking up residence in Galilee.

7,1 But these same sectarians whom I am discussing here disregarded the name of Jesus, and neither called themselves Jessaeans, kept the name of Jews, nor termed themselves Christians—but "Nazoraeans" supposedly from the name of the place "Nazareth." But they are Jews in every way and nothing else.

7,2 They use not only the New Testament but the Old Testament as well, as the Jews do. For they do not repudiate the legislation, the prophets, and the books which are called Writings by the Jews and by themselves. They have no different views but confess everything in full accord with the doctrine of the Law and like the Jews, except that they are supposedly believers in Christ. (3) For they acknowledge both the resurrection of the dead and that all things have been created by God,[35] and they declare that God is one, and that his Son is Jesus Christ.

7,4 They are perfectly versed in the Hebrew language, for the entire Law, the prophets, and the so-called Writings—I mean the poetic books, Kings, Chronicles, Esther and all the rest—are read in Hebrew among them, as of course they are among the Jews. (5) They are different from Jews, and different from Christians, only in the following ways. They disagree with Jews because of their belief in Christ; but they are not in accord with Christians because they are still fettered by the Law—circumcision,

[34] Matt 2:23
[35] This is said of the Ebionites at Iren. 1.26.2. Cf. Hipp. Refut. 7.34.1; PsT 3.

the Sabbath, and the rest.[36] (6) As to Christ, I cannot say whether they too are misled by the wickedness of Cerinthus and Merinthus, and regard him as a mere man—or whether, as the truth is, they affirm that he was born of Mary by the Holy Spirit.

7,7 This sect of Nazoraeans is to be found in Beroea[37] near Coelesyria, in the Decapolis near Pella, and in Bashanitis at the place called Cocabe[38]—Khokhabe in Hebrew. (8) For that was its place of origin, since all the disciples had settled in Pella after their remove from Jerusalem—Christ having told them to abandon Jerusalem and withdraw from it[39] because of the siege it was about to undergo. And they settled in Peraea for this reason and, as I said, lived their lives there. It was from this that the Nazoraean sect had its origin.

8,1 But they too are wrong to boast of circumcision, and persons like themselves are still "under a curse,"[40] since they cannot fulfill the Law. For how will they be able to fulfil the Law's provision, "Thrice a year thou shalt appear before the Lord thy God, at the feasts of Unleavened Bread, Tabernacles and Pentecost,"[41] on the site of Jerusalem? (2) For since the site is closed off,[42] and the Law's provisions cannot be fulfilled, it must be plain to anyone with sense that Christ came to be the fulfiller of the Law—not to destroy the Law but to fulfill the Law—and to lift the curse that had been pronounced on transgression of the Law. (3) For after Moses had given every commandment he came to the end of the book and "included the whole in a curse"[43] by saying, "Cursed is he that continueth not in all the words that are written in this book to do them."[44]

8,4 Hence Christ came to free what had been fettered with the bonds of the curse by granting us, in place of the lesser commandments which cannot be fulfilled, ones which are greater and which are not inconsistent with the completion of the task as the former ones were. (5) For often in every Sect, when I reached the point, I have explained in connection with the Sabbath, circumcision and the rest, how the Lord has granted us something more perfect.

---

[36] Cf. Iren. 1.26.2 (of the Ebionites); Eus. H. E. 3,27.3.
[37] Cf. Jer. Vir. Ill.3 (Richardson p. 9).
[38] Cf. Eus. H. E. 17.14.
[39] Cf. Eus. H. E. 3.5.3.
[40] Gal 3:10
[41] Cf. Gal 3:22.
[42] Cf. Justin Apol. I 47.5-6.
[43] Cf. Gal 3:22.
[44] Gal 3:10 and Deut 27:26

8,6 But how can people like these be defensible since they have not obeyed the Holy Spirit who said through the apostles to gentile converts, "Assume no burden save the necessary things, that ye abstain from blood, and from things strangled, and fornication, and from meats offered to idols?"[45] (7) And how can they fail to lose the grace of God, when the holy apostle Paul says, "If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing . . . whosoever of you do glory in the Law are fallen from grace?"[46]

9,1 In this Sect too, my brief discussion will be sufficient. People of their kind are refutable at once and easy to detect and, rather (than being heretical Christians), are Jews and nothing else. (2) Yet to the Jews they are very much enemies. Not only do Jewish people bear hatred against them; they even stand up at dawn, at midday, and toward evening, three times a day when they recite their prayers in the synagogues, and curse and anathematize them—saying three times a day, "God curse the Nazoraeans."[47] (3) For they harbor a further grudge against them, if you please, because despite their Jewish origin, they preach that Jesus is < the > Christ—something that is the opposite of those who are still Jews and have not accepted Jesus.

9,4 They have the Gospel according to Matthew in its entirety in Hebrew.[48] For it is clear that they still preserve this as it was originally written, in the Hebrew alphabet. But I do not know whether they have also excised the genealogies from Abraham till Christ.

9,5 But now that we have also detected this sect—like a stinging insect that is small, and yet causes pain with its poison—and have squashed it with the words of the truth, let us go on to the next, beloved, praying for help from God.

---

[45] Acts 15:28-29

[46] Gal 5:2-4

[47] Some variation of the prayer, "For the apostates let there be no hope, and let the rule of wickedness be uprooted swiftly, in our days, and let the *notsrim* (**נצרים**, Christians) and sectarians (**מינים**) perish in an instant" etc. is found in the great majority of the liturgical MSS of the Cairo Genizah See Pourkier, and especially Ehrlich and Langer, "Earliest Texts," pp. 63-112. For Christian references to the prayer, see Justin Dial. 16; 47; Jer. In Isa 5:18-19 (Adriaen, *CC* 73 p. 76); Orig. Cels. 2.29.

[48] Cf. Eus. H. E. 3.24.6; 39.16; 5.10.3; Theophania 4.12; Jer. Vir. Ill. 3; C. Pelag. 3.2. The Ebionites are said to use the Gospel according to Matthew and none other at Iren. 1.26.2; Eus. H. E. 3.27.4.

30.

Against Ebionites.[1] *Number ten, but thirty of the series*

1,1 Following these and holding views like theirs, Ebion,[2] the founder of the Ebionites, arose in the world in his turn as a monstrosity with many forms, and practically represented in himself the snake-like form of the mythical many-headed hydra. He was of the Nazoraeans' school, but preached and taught other things than they.

1,2 For it was as though someone were to collect a set of jewelry from various precious stones and an outfit of varicolored clothing and tog himself up conspicuously. Ebion, in reverse, took any and every doctrine which was dreadful, lethal, disgusting, ugly and unconvincing, thoroughly contentious, from every sect, and patterned himself after them all. (3) For he has the Samaritans' unpleasantness but the Jews' name, the opinion of the Ossaeans, Nazoraeans and Nasaraeans, the form of the Cerinthians, and the perversity of the Carpocratians. And he wants to have just the Christians' title—most certainly not their behavior, opinion and knowledge, and the consensus as to faith of the Gospels and Apostles!

1,4 But since he is midway between all the sects, as one might say, he amounts to nothing. The words of scripture, "I was almost in all evil, in the midst of the church and synagogue,"[3] are applicable to him. (5) For although he is Samaritan, he rejects the name because of its objectionability. And while professing himself a Jew, he is the opposite of the Jews—though he does agree with them in part as I shall prove later with God's help, through the proofs of it in my rebuttal of them.

2,1 For this Ebion was contemporary with the Jews, and <since he was> with them, he was derived from them. (2) In the first place, he said

---

[1] Epiphanius draws on Hipp. Synt. which is his source for the name, "Ebion," probably on Irenaeus, and certainly on some version of the Clementina, which he calls the Travels of Peter and which Strecker (*Judenchristentum*) suggests was the Grundschrift of the Clementina. Epiphanius mentions, as a separate document, the Ascents of James, (now Clem. Rec. 1.33-70). He appears to know the Letter of Clement to James, and some other "Epistles of Clement," which might be the ones called the Epistles Concerning Virginity. At 13,2 Epiphanius quotes an extract from an "Ebionite" Gospel according to Matthew; some of his other information is from oral sources.

PsT 3.3 depends upon Hipp. Synt. Tertullian, who speaks of an "Ebion," may also have known this work. Origen, on the other hand, may have had some personal contact with Jewish Christianity. So may Eusebius (H. E. 3.27.4), although he seems to follow Origen.

[2] For the name, Ebion, see Hipp. Refut. 7.34.1; PsT 3.3; Jer. Adv. Lucif. 23; Doctr. Pat. 41; Tert. Carn. Chr. 14; 18; 24; Virg. Vel. 6; Praescr. 10; 33

[3] Prov 5:14

that Christ was conceived by sexual intercourse and the seed of a man, Joseph[4]—I have already said that he agreed with the others in everything, with this one difference, his adherence to Judaism's Law of the Sabbath, circumcision, and all the other Jewish and Samaritan observances. (3) But like the Samaritans he goes still further than the Jews. He added the rule about taking care not to touch a gentile;[5] (4) and that every day, if a man has been with a woman[6] and has left her, he must immerse himself in water—any water he can find, the sea or any other. (5) Moreover, if he should meet anyone while returning from his immersion and bath in the water, he runs back again for another immersion, often even with his clothes on![7]

2,6 This sect now forbids celibacy and continence altogether,[8] as do the other sects which are like it. For at one time they prided themselves on virginity, presumably because of James the Lord's brother,< and so > address their treatises to "elders and virgins."[9]

2,7 Their origin came after the fall of Jerusalem. For since practically all who had come to faith in Christ had settled in Peraea then, in Pella, a town in the "Decapolis"[10] the Gospel mentions, which is near Batanaea and Bashanitis—as they had moved there then and were living there, this provided an opportunity for Ebion. (8) And as far as I know, he first lived in a village called Cocabe in the district of Qarnaim—also called Ashtaroth—in Bashanitis. There he began his evil teaching—the place, if you please, where the Nazoraeans I have spoken of came from. (9) For since Ebion was connected with them and they with him, each party shared its own wickedness with the other. Each also differed from the other to some extent, but they emulated each other in malice. But I have already spoken at length, both in other works and in the other Sects, about the locations of Cocabe and Arabia.

---

[4] Iren. 3.21.1; Eus. H. E. 3.27.2; Origen Cels. 5.61; in Matt 16:12; Tert. Carn. Chr. 14

[5] At Jos. Bell. 2.119 Essenes are said to wash after touching foreigners. Cf. the various regulations forbidding contact with gentiles which are found in the Covenant of Damascus, CD 11,14 (Wise et al. p. 69); 12,6-11 (p. 70). At Clem Hom. 13.4.3 it is said that Christians do not eat at a gentile table.

[6] Cf. Lev 15:18; Clem. Hom. 7.8.2.

[7] At Hipp. Refut. 9.15.4-6 the Book of Elxai is said to prescribe this procedure for a person bitten by a mad dog.

[8] Cf. Ep. Clem. Ad Jac. 7.1-2, and see p. 49, 19,7.

[9] See the First Epistle of the Blessed Clement, the Disciple of Peter the Apostle, 1: "to the blessed brother virgins…to the holy sister virgins…" (Roberts and Donaldson, p. 55).

[10] Cf. Matt 4:25.

3,1 And at first, as I said, Ebion declared that Christ is the offspring of a man, that is, of Joseph. For a while now, however, various of his followers have been giving conflicting accounts of Christ, as though they have decided on something untenable and impossible themselves. (2) But I think it may be since they were joined by Elxai—the false prophet <I mentioned earlier> in the tracts called "Sampsaeans," "Ossenes" and "Elkasaites"—that they tell an imaginary story about Christ and the Holy Spirit as he did.

3,3[11] For some of them even say that Adam is Christ—the man who was formed first and infused with God's breath.[12] (4) But others among them say that he is from above; created before all things, a spirit, both higher than the angels and Lord of all; and that he is called Christ, the heir of the world there.[13] But he comes here when he chooses,[14] as he came in Adam and appeared to the patriarchs clothed with Adam's body. And in the last days the same Christ who had come to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, came and donned Adam's body, and appeared to men, was crucified, rose and ascended. (6) But again, when they choose to, they say, "No! The Spirit—that is, the Christ—came to him and put on the man called Jesus."[15] And they get all giddy from making different suppositions about him at different times.

3,7 They too accept the Gospel according to Matthew. Like the Cerinthians and Merinthians, they too use it alone. They call it, "According to the Hebrews," and it is true to say that only Matthew expounded and preached the Gospel in the Hebrew language and alphabet[16] in the New Testament.

3,8 But some may already have replied that the Gospel of John too, translated from Greek to Hebrew, is in the Jewish treasuries, I mean the treasuries at Tiberias, and is stored there secretly, as certain Jewish converts have described to me in detail. (9) And not only that, but it is said that the book of the Acts of the Apostles, also translated from Greek to Hebrew, is there in the treasuries, so that the Jews who have read it, the ones who told me about it, have been converted to Christ from this.

4,1 One of them was Josephus—not the ancient Josephus, the author and chronicler, but Josephus of Tiberias, <born> during the old age of

---

[11] With 3,3-5 cf. Hipp. Refut. 9.14.1.

[12] Adam has the Spirit of Christ and is therefore the first appearance in the world of the true prophet: Clem. Hom. 3.20-21; Rec. 1.45.4.

[13] Clem. Hom. 3.20.2.

[14] Loc. cit.

[15] See p. 119 n. 14.

[16] Cf. Iren. 1.26.2; 3.11.7; Eus. H. E. 3.27.4; Jer. C. Pelag 3.2; Vir. Ill. 3 (Richardson p. 8).

the Emperor Constantine of blessed memory. This Josephus was awarded the rank of count by the Emperor himself, and was authorized to build a church for Christ in Tiberias itself, and in Diocaesarea, Capernaum and the other towns. He also suffered a great deal from the Jews themselves before he came to the Emperor's notice.

4,2 For this Josephus was counted as one of their men of rank. There are such persons, <who> rank next after the patriarch and are called "apostles."[17] They attend on the patriarch, and often stay with him day and night without intermission, to give him counsel and refer points of law to him. (3) Now the patriarch at that time was called Ellel. (I think that was how Josephus pronounced his name, unless I am mistaken because of the time). He was descended from the Gamaliel who had been one of their patriarchs. (4) One may suspect, and others have suggested this as well, that these patriarchs were descended from the first Gamaliel, the Savior's contemporary, who gave the godly counsel of refraining from abuse of the apostles.

4,5 When Ellel was dying he asked for the bishop who then lived near Tiberias, and received holy baptism from him *in extremis* for a pretendedly medical reason. (6) For he had sent for him by Josephus, as though he were a doctor, and he had the room cleared and begged the bishop, "Give me the seal in Christ!" (7) The bishop summoned the servants and ordered water prepared, as though intending to give the patriarch, who was very sick, some treatment for his illness with water. They did what they were told, for they did not know. And sending everyone out from pretended modesty the patriarch was vouchsafed the laver and the holy mysteries.

5,1 Josephus told me <this> in conversation. For I heard all this from his own lips and not from anyone else, in his old age when he was about 70 or even more. (2) For I was entertained at his home in Scythopolis; he had moved from Tiberias, and owned a notable estate there in Scythopolis. Eusebius of blessed memory, the bishop of Vercelli in Italy, was Josephus' guest, since he had been banished by Constantius for his orthodox faith. I and the other brethren had come there to visit him, and we were entertained too, along with Eusebius.

5,3 Now when I met Josephus at his home, asked him about himself, and found that he had been a prominent Jew, I also inquired his reason, and why it was that he had come over to Christianity. And I heard all this plainly (from him), not at secondhand from anyone else. (4) And since I

[17] Cf. Eus. In Isa 18:1-2; Jer. In Gal 1:1 (Raspanti p. 11).

think that, because of the Hebrew translations in the treasuries, the things the man went through are worth recording for the edification of the faithful, I deliberately give Josephus' entire reason.

5,5 Josephus was not only privileged to become a faithful Christian, but a great despiser of Arians as well. In that city, I mean Scythopolis, he was the only orthodox Christian—they were all Arians. (6) Had it not been that he was a count, and the rank of count protected him from Arian persecution, he could not even have undertaken to live in the town, especially while Patrophilus was the Arian bishop. Patrophilus was very influential because of his wealth and severity, and his familiar acquaintance with the Emperor Constantius. (7) But there was another, younger man in town too, an orthodox believer of Jewish parentage. He did not even dare <to associate> with me in public, though he used to visit me secretly.

5,8 But Josephus told me something plausible and amusing, though I would think that even <here> he was telling the truth. He claimed that after his wife died, fearing that the Arians might take him by force and make him a cleric—to flatter him into conversion to the sect they would often promise him higher preferments if need be, and to make him a bishop. Well, he claimed that this was why he had married a second wife, to escape their ordinations!

6,1 But I shall go back to telling the story of the patriarch and make Josephus' own story known in all its particulars to those who care to read it, in the words he used to me. (2) "Just as the patriarch was being granted baptism," he told me, "I was peeping in through the cracks in the doors and realized what the bishop was doing to the patriarch—found it out, and kept it to myself. (3) For besides," Josephus said, "the patriarch had a very ample sum of money ready, and he reached out, gave it to the bishop, and said, 'Offer it for me. It is written that things are bound and loosed on earth through the priests of God, and <that> these things will be loosed and bound in heaven.'[18] (4) When this was over," he said, "and the doors were opened, the patriarch's visitors asked him how he was after his treatment, and he replied that he was *very* well For he knew what he was talking about!"

6,5 Then <after> two or three days, with the bishop visiting him often in the guise of a physician, the patriarch fell asleep with a good hope in store. He had entrusted his own son, who was quite young, to Josephus and another very capable <elder>. (6) All business, then, was transacted

[18] Cf. Matt 18:18.

through these two, since the patriarch, being a boy, was still childish, and was being brought up under their supervision.

6,7 During this time Josephus' mind was often troubled over the rites that had been performed in the affair of the baptism, and he was considering what he should do. Now there was a "gazophylacium" there which was sealed—"gaza" means "treasure" in Hebrew. (8) As many had different notions about this treasury because of its seal, Josephus plucked up the courage to open it unobserved—and found no money, but books money could not buy. (9) Browsing through them he found the Gospel of John translated from Greek to Hebrew, as I said, and the Acts of the Apostles—and Matthew's Gospel moreover, which is actually Hebrew. After reading from them he was once more distressed in mind, for he was somehow troubled over the faith of Christ. But now he was prodded for two reasons, his reading of the books and the patriarch's initiation. Still, as often happens, his heart was hardened.

7,1 While all his time was occupied with these things, the boy Ellel had left to be reared as patriarch was growing up. (No one usurps the positions of authority among the Jews, but son succeeds father.) (2) Just as the lad was reaching full vigor some idle youths of his own age with vicious habits unfortunately met him. (I guess he was called Judas, but because of the time I am not quite sure.) (3) His young contemporaries got him into many evil practices, seductions of women and unholy sexual unions. They undertook to help him in his licentious <activities> with certain magic devices—making certain love-philtres and compelling free women with incantations to be brought under duress for his seduction.

7,4 Josephus and his fellow elder, who were obliged to attend the boy, bore this with difficulty and often both charged him and admonished him verbally. But he preferred to listen to the young men, and he hid his indecencies and denied them. And Josephus did not dare to voice his accusations of him openly; instead he admonished him, as though for his education.

7,5 Well, they went to Gadara for the hot baths. There is a gathering there every year. Persons who wish to bathe for a certain number of days arrive from every quarter supposedly to get rid of their ailments, though this is a trick of the devil. For where wonders have been given by God the adversary has already spread his deadly nets—the bathing there is mixed!

7,6 There happened to be a free woman of unusual beauty in the bath. Lured by the habit of his licentiousness the young man rubbed his side against the woman's as he strolled about in the hot-air room. (7) But being Christian, she naturally made the sign of the cross. (There was no

need for her to behave improperly and bathe in mixed company. These things happen to simple lay persons, from the laxity of the teachers who do not forewarn them through their instruction.) (8) Still, that God might make his wonders manifest, the youngster, I mean the patriarch, failed in his enterprise. For he sent emissaries to the woman and promised her gifts; but she insulted his messengers and did not yield to the pampered youth's futile efforts.

8,1 Then, when his helpers learned of the boy's pain which he betrayed for the girl, they undertook to prepare more powerful magic for him, as Josephus himself described it to me in full. (2) After sunset they took the unfortunate lad to the neighboring cemetery. (In my country there are places of assembly of this kind, called "caverns," made by hewing them out of cliff sides.) (3) Taking him there the cheats who accompanied him recited certain incantations and spells, and did very impious things to him and in the name of the woman.

8,4 By God's will this came to the attention of the other elder, Josephus' partner, and on realizing what was happening, he told Josephus. And he began by bemoaning his lot, and said, "Brother, we are wretched men and vessels of destruction! What sort of person are we attending?" (5) And when Josephus asked the reason, no sooner were the words out of his mouth than the elder seized his hand and took Josephus to the place where the persons doomed to die, with the youth, were holding their assembly in the cemetery for magic. (6) Standing outside the door they listened to what the others were doing, but withdrew when they came out. (It was not dark yet; it was just about sundown, and one could still see dimly.) (7) After the monsters of impiety had left the tomb Josephus went in and saw certain <vessels> and other implements of jugglery thrown on the ground. They made water on them and covered them with a heap of dust, he said, and left.

8,8 But they knew the sort of woman on whose account they had plotted these wicked things, and he watched to see whether they would win. (9) When the sorcerers had not prevailed—the woman had the aid of the sign and faith of Christ—he learned that the youngster had waited for the girl's arrival on three nights, and later quarreled with the persons who had performed the jugglery because he had not succeeded. (10) This made Josephus' third lesson—where Christ's name was, and the sign of his cross, the power of sorcery did not prevail. But at this point he was by no means convinced that he should become a Christian.

9,1 Then the Lord appeared to him in a dream, and said, "I am Jesus, whom your forefathers crucified; but believe in me." When he was not convinced even by his he fell into grave illness and was given up for

lost. But the Lord appeared to him again, and told him to believe and he would be healed. And he promised and recovered, and again persevered in his obstinacy.

9,2 He fell ill a second time in turn, and was given up in the same way. When he was assumed to be dying by his Jewish kin he heard the words from them that they always repeat in secrecy among themselves. (3) An elder, a scholar of the law, came and whispered to him, "Believe <in> Jesus, crucified under Pontius Pilate the governor, Son of God first yet later born of Mary; the Christ of God and risen from the dead. And believe that he will come to judge and quick and the dead." That same Josephus told me this plainly during his story, as I can truthfully say.

9,4 Besides, I have heard this sort of thing from someone else. He was still a Jew from fear of the Jews, but he often spent time in Christian company, and he honored Christians and loved them. He traveled with me in the wilderness of Bethel and Ephraim, when I was going up to the mountains from Jericho and saying something to him about the advent of Christ, and he did not dispute it. (5) I was amazed—he was learned in the Law as well and able to argue—and I asked the reason why he did not dispute, but agreed with me, about Jesus Christ our Lord. I had got no further than this when he too revealed to me that when he himself had been near death they had told him secretly, in a whisper, "Jesus Christ, the crucified Son of God, will judge you." (6) But let this be recorded here, from a genuine report about these persons and about this formula.

10,1 Josephus was still sick. And though, as I said, the presbyter, along with the others, had told him, "Jesus Christ will judge you," he was still hardened. But the Lord in his lovingkindness again said to him in a dream, "Lo, I heal you; but rise and believe!" But though he recovered again, he did not believe. (2) When he was well the Lord appeared to him in a dream once more and scolded him for not believing. And he promised him, "If, for an assurance of your faith, you choose to work any miracle in my name, call upon me and I will do it."

10,3 There was a madman in the city who used to roam the town, I mean Tiberias, naked. If he was dressed he would often tear his clothing apart, as such people will. (4) Now Josephus was overcome with awe and wished to put the vision to the test, although he was still doubtful. So he brought the man inside, shut the door, took water, made the sign of the cross over it, and sprinkled it on the madman with the words, "In the name of Jesus of Nazareth the crucified begone from him, demon, and let him be made whole!"

10,5 Falling down with a loud cry, the man lay motionless for a long time foaming profusely and retching, and Josephus supposed that he had

died. (6) But after a while he rubbed his forehead and got up and, once on his feet and seeing his own nakedness, he hid himself and covered his privy parts with his hands, for he could no longer bear to see his own nakedness. (7) Dressed by Josephus himself in one of his own himatia, in proof of his comprehension and sanity, he came and thanked him and God profusely, for he realized that he had been cured through Josephus. He spread word of him in town, and this miracle became known to the Jews there. (8) Much talk ensued in the city from people saying that Josephus had opened the treasuries, found the Name of God in writing and read it, and was working geat miracles. And what they were saying was true, though not in the way they thought.

10,9 Josephus, however, still remained hardened in heart. But the merciful God who is continually arranging good opportunities for those who love him, grants them to those whom he deems worthy of life. (11,1) As things turned out for Josephus himself, after Judas the patriarch, of whom we have spoken, grew up—I guess he was called that—to repay Josephus he granted him the revenue of the apostolate. (2) He was sent to Cilicia with a commission, and on arriving there collected the tithes and firstfruits from the Jews of the province, from every city in Cilicia. (3) At this time he lodged next to the church, I don't know in which city. But he made friends with the bishop there, <went to him> unobserved, borrowed the Gospels and read them.

11,4 Since <he was> very severe as an apostle should be—as I said, this is their name for the rank—and indeed was a reformer, he was always intent on what would make for the establishment of good order and purged and demoted many of the appointed synagogue-heads, priests, elders and "azanites" (meaning their kind of deacons or assistants), many were angry with him. As though in an attempt to pay him back these people took no little trouble to pry into his affairs and find out what he was doing. (5) For this reason a crowd of meddlers burst in upon him at home in his residence, and caught him pouring over the Gospels. They seized the book and grabbed the man, dragged him to the floor with shouts, bore him off to the synagogue with no light mistreatment, and beat him as the Law prescribes. (6) This made his first trial; however, the bishop of the town arrived and got him out. Another time they caught him on a journey, he told me, and threw him into the river Cydnus. <When they saw> him taken by the current they thought he had gone under and drowned, and were glad of it.

11,7 But a little later he was vouchsafed holy baptism—for he was rescued (from the river). He went to court, made friends with the Emperor Constantine, and told him his whole story—how he was of the highest

Jewish rank, and how the divine visions kept appearing to him, since the Lord was summoning him to his holy calling, and the salvation of his faith and knowledge. (8) And the good emperor—a true servant of Christ, and, after David, Hezekiah and Josiah, the king with the most godly zeal—rewarded him with a rank in his realm, as I have said already. (9) He made him a count and told him to ask what he wanted in his turn.

Josephus asked nothing of the emperor but this very great favor—permission by imperial rescript to build Christ's churches in the Jewish towns and villages where no one had ever been able to found churches, since there are no Greeks, Samaritans or Christians among the population. (10) This <rule> of having no gentiles among them is observed especially at Tiberias, Diocaesarea, Sepphoris, Nazareth and Capernaum.

12,1 After receiving the letter and the authorization along with his title, Josephus came to Tiberias. Besides, he had a draft on the imperial treasury, and he himself had been honored with a salary from the emperor.

12,2 And so he began to build in Tiberias. There was a very large temple in the town already, I think they may have called it the Adrianeum. The citizens may have been trying to restore this Adrianeum, which was standing unfinished, for a public bath. (3) When Josephus found this he took the opportunity from it; and as he found that there were already four walls raised to some height, made of stones four feet long, he began the erection of the church from that point.

12,4 But lime was needed, and the other building material. He therefore had a number of ovens, perhaps seven altogether, set up outside the city. (In the language of the country they call these "furnaces.") But the horrid Jews who are always up to trying anything did not spare their usual sorcery. Those grand Jews wasted their time on magic and jugglery to bind the fire, but they did not entirely succeed.

12,5 Well, the fire was smouldering and not doing anything but had practically ceased to be fire.[19] When those whose task it was to feed the fire with fuel—I mean brushwood or scrub—told Josephus what had been done he rushed from the city, stung to the quick and moved with zeal for the Lord. (6) He ordered water fetched in a vessel, (I mean a flask, but the local inhabitants call this a "cacubium,") <and> took this vessel of water in the sight of all—a crowd of Jews had gathered to watch, eager to see how it would turn out and what Josephus would try to do. Tracing the sign of the cross on the vessel with his own finger, and invoking the name of

[19] ἀλλὰ τῆς ἰδίας ὡς εἰπεῖν φύσεως ἐκτὸς ἐγένετο

Jesus, he cried out, (7) "In the name of Jesus of Nazareth, whom my fathers and those of all here present crucified, may there be power in this water to set at naught all sorcery and enchantment these men have wrought, and to work a miracle on the fire that the Lord's house may be finished." (8) With that he wet his hand and sprinkled the water on each furnace. And the spells were broken, and in the presence of all, the fire blazed up. And the crowds of spectators cried, "There is one God, who comes to the aid of the Christians," and went away.

12,9 Though they harmed the man on many occasions, he eventually restored part of the temple at Tiberias and finished a small church. He left then and came to Scythopolis and made his home. However, he completed buildings in Diocaesarea and certain other towns. (10) So much for my account and description of these events, which I recalled here because of the translation of the books, the rendering from Greek to Hebrew of the Gospel of John and the Acts of the Apostles.

13,1 But I shall resume the thread of my argument against Ebion—because of the Gospel according to Matthew the course of the discussion obliged me to insert the whole of the knowledge which I had gained. (2) Now in what they call a Gospel according to Matthew, though it is not the entire Gospel but is corrupt and mutilated—and they call this thing "Hebrew"!—the following passage is found: "There was a certain man named Jesus, and he was about thirty years of age,[20] who chose us. And coming to Capernaum he entered into the house of Simon surnamed Peter, and opened his mouth and said, (3) Passing beside the Sea of Tiberias I chose John and James, the sons of Zebedee,[21] and Simon and Andrew and < Philip and Bartholomew, James the son of Alphaeus and Thomas >, Thaddaeus, Simon the Zealot, and Judas Iscariot.[22] Thee too, Matthew, seated at the receipt of custom, did I call, and thou didst follow me.[23] I will, then, that ye be twelve apostles[24] for a testimony to Israel." (4) And, "John came baptizing, and there went out unto him Pharisees and were baptized, and all Jerusalem. And John had a garment of camel's hair, and a girdle of skin about his loins. And his meat," it says, "was wild honey, whose taste was the taste of manna, as a cake in oil."[25] (5) This, if you

[20] Cf. Lk 3:23

[21] Cf. Matt 4:18. What precedes is a combination of the Gospel passages Mark 1:21; 29; Matt 5:2; Matt 4:18.

[22] Cf. Matt 10:2-4; Luke 6:14-16. The list given here, however, is not identical with either.

[23] Cf. Matt 9:9.

[24] Cf. Clem. Rec. 1.40.4; Clem. Alex. Strom. 6.418.2.

[25] Cf. Matt 3:4-5; Num 11:8.

please, to turn the account of the truth into falsehood, and substitute "a cake in honey" for "locusts"!

13,6 But the beginning of their Gospel is, "It came to pass in the days of Herod, king of Judaea, <in the high-priesthood of Caiaphas>, that <a certain> man, John <by name>, came baptizing with the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan, and he was said to be of the lineage of Aaron the priest, the son of Zacharias and Elizabeth, and all went out unto him."[26] (7) And after saying a good deal it adds, "When the people had been baptized Jesus came also and was baptized of John. And as he came up out of the water the heavens were opened, and he saw the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove which descended and entered into him. And (there came) a voice from heaven saying, Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased,[27] and again, This day have I begotten thee.[28] And straightway a great light shone round about the place.[29] Seeing this," it says, "John said unto him, Who art thou, Lord?[30] And again (there came) a voice to him from heaven, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.[31] (8) And then," it says, "John fell down before him and said, I pray thee, Lord, do thou baptize me. But he forbade him saying, Let it alone, for thus it is meet that all be fulfilled."[32]

14,1 See how their utterly false teaching is all lame, crooked, and not right anywhere! (2) For by supposedly using their same <so-called Gospel according to Matthew> Cerinthus and Carpocrates want to prove from the beginning of Matthew, by the genealogy, that Christ is the product of Joseph's seed and Mary. (3) But these people have something else in mind. They falsify the genealogical tables in Matthew's Gospel and make its opening, as I said, "It came to pass in the days of Herod, king of Judaea, in the high-priesthood of Caiaphas, that a certain man, John by name, came baptizing with the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan" and so on. (4) This is because they maintain that Jesus is really a man, as I said, but that Christ, who descended in the form of a dove, has entered him—as we have found already in other sects—<and> been united with him. Christ himself <is from God on high, but Jesus> is the offspring of a man's seed and a woman.

---

[26] Cf. Luke 1:5; Mark 1:4-5.
[27] This is closest to Luke 3:21-22.
[28] Heb. 1:5; Ps 2:7; Gospel according to the Hebrews H-S I p. 169 which, however, is a quoted from Epiph. There is no other source for the quotation.
[29] Cf. Justin Dial. 7.
[30] Acts 9:5
[31] Cf. Matt 3:17
[32] Matt 12:47-50

14,5 But again they deny that he is a man, supposedly on the basis of the words the Savior spoke when he was told, "Behold thy mother and thy brethren stand without," "Who are my mother and my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand toward his disciples and said, These are my brethren and mother and sisters, these that do the will of my Father." (6) And so Ebion, as I said, who is crammed with all sorts of trickery, shows himself in many forms—making him a monstrosity, as I indicated above.

15,1 But they use certain other books as well—supposedly the so-called Travels of Peter written by Clement, though they corrupt their contents while leaving a few genuine passages. (2) Clement himself convicts them of this in every way in his general epistles which are read in the holy churches, because his faith and speech are of a different character than their spurious productions in his name in the Travels. He himself teaches celibacy, and they will not accept it. He extols Elijah, David, Samson and all the prophets, whom they abhor.[33]

15,3 In the Travels they have changed everything to suit themselves and slandered Peter in many ways, saying that he was baptized daily[34] for purification as they are. And they say he abstained from flesh and dressed meat as they do, and any other dish made from meat—since both Ebion himself, and Ebionites, entirely abstain from these.[35] (4) When you ask one of them why they do not eat meat, having no explanation they answer foolishly and say, "Since it is a product of the congress and intercourse of bodies, we do not eat it." Thus, according to their own foolish regurgitations, they are wholly abominable themselves, since they are the results of the intercourse of a man and a woman.

16,1 They too receive baptism, apart from their daily baptisms. And they celebrate supposed mysteries from year to year in imitation of the sacred mysteries of the church, using unleavened bread—and the other part of the mystery with water only.

16,2 But as I said, they set side by side two who have been appointed by God, one being Christ, but one the devil. And they say that Christ has been allotted the world to come, but that this world has been entrusted

---

[33] The Clementina are at least suspicious of the prophets. Ep. Pet. Ad Jac. 1.4 warns of being confused by their contradictory utterances. Cf. Clem. Hom. 3.53.2. For a Nag Hammadi attack on the prophets see GT 52.

[34] This seems implied at Clem Hom. 11.1.1-2; Rec. 4.3.1; 8.1.1. See, however, Strecker, *Judenchristentum* p. 208.

[35] Cf. Clem. Hom. 8.15.3-4.

to the devil[36]—supposedly by the decree of the Almighty, at the request of each of them. (3) And they say that this is why Jesus was begotten of the seed of a man and chosen, and thus has been named Son of God by election, after the Christ who came to him from on high in the form of a dove. (4) But they say that he is not begotten of God the Father but created as one of the archangels, and that he is ruler both of angels and of all creatures of <the> Almighty; and that he came and instructed us <to abolish the sacrifices>. (5) As their so-called Gospel says, "I came to abolish the sacrifices, and if ye cease not from sacrifice, wrath will not cease from you."[37] Both these and certain things of the kind are guileful inventions which are current among them.

16,6 They speak of other Acts of Apostles in which there is much thoroughly impious material, and from them arm themselves against the truth in deadly earnest. (7) They lay down certain ascents and instructions in the supposed "Ascents of James," as though he were giving orders against the temple and sacrifices, and the fire on the altar—and much else that is full of nonsense.

16,8 Nor are they ashamed to accuse Paul[38] here with certain fabrications of their false apostles' villainy and imposture. They say that he was Tarsean—which he admits himself and does not deny. And they suppose that he was of Greek parentage, taking the occasion for this from the (same) passage because of his frank statement, "I am a man of Tarsus, a citizen of no mean city."[39] (9) They then claim that he was Greek and the son of a Greek mother and Greek father, but that he had gone up to Jerusalem, stayed there for a while, desired to marry a daughter of the high priest, and had therefore became a proselyte and been circumcised. But since he still could not marry that sort of girl he became angry and wrote against circumcision, and against the Sabbath and the legislation.

17,1 But he is making a completely false accusation, this horrid serpent with his poverty of understanding. For "Ebion," translated from Hebrew to Greek, means "poor." For truly he is poor, in understanding, hope and actuality, since he regards Christ as a mere man, and thus has come to

---

[36] See Clem. Hom. 3.19.2; 20.2.1-2; Rec. 7.3-4. At Clem. Hom. 8.21.1-2 the "king of the present" (Satan) tempts the "king of the future" (Christ). In Manichean literature see Man. Hom. 41,18-20.

[37] Cf. Clem. Hom. 2.44.2; 3.26.3; 3.45.1-2; 56.4, and Rec. 1.37 1.39.12. Mandaean literature deprecates the sacrifices, e.g. at *Ginza* 9,83; 33,2; 43,8-10.

[38] Cf. Ep. Pet. Ad Jac. 2.5; Clem. Rec. 1.70-71. Ebionite opposition to Paul is mentioned at Iren. 1.26.2; Orig. Cels. 5.65; Hom. 19 in Jer. 18:12 (Klostermann p. 167).

[39] Cf. Acts 21:39.

hope in him with poverty of faith.[40] (2) They themselves, if you please, boastfully claim that they are poor because they sold their possessions in the apostles' time and laid them at the apostles' feet, and went over to a life of poverty and renunciation;[41] and thus, they say, they are called "poor" by everyone. (3) But there is no truth to this claim of theirs either; he was really named Ebion.[42] I suppose the poor wretch was named prophetically by his father and mother.

17,4 And how many other dreadful, false, observances they have, chock full of wickedness! When one of them falls ill or is bitten by a snake, he gets into water and invokes the names in Elxai—of heaven, earth, salt, water, winds, "angels of righteousness" <as> they say, bread and oil[43]—and begins to say, "Come to my aid and rid me of my pain!"

17,5 But I have already indicated, even before this, that Ebion did not know of these things. After a time his followers became associated with Elxai, and they have the circumcision, the Sabbath and the customs of Ebion, but Elxai's delusion. (6) Thus they believe that Christ is a manlike figure invisible to human eyes, ninety-six miles—or twenty-four schoena, if you please!—tall; six schoena, or twenty-four miles wide; and some other measurement through. Opposite him the Holy Spirit stands invisibly as well, in the form of a female, with the same dimensions. (7) "And how did I find the dimensions?" he says. "I saw from the mountains that the heads were level with them, and from observing the height of the mountain, I learned the dimensions of Christ and the Holy Spirit." (8) I have already spoken of this in the Sect, "Against Ossaeans." I have put it down here though, in passing, lest it be thought that I fail from forgetfulness to mention characteristics of any nation and sect which are also found in others.

18,1 Ebion too preached in Asia and Rome, but the roots of these thorny side-growths come mostly from Nabataea and Banias, Moabitis, and Cocabe in Bashanitis beyond Adrai—in Cyprus as well. (2) They compel them to give their children in marriage even when they are too young—with the permission of their teachers, if you please! (Ebionites have elders and heads of synagogues, and they call their church a synagogue, not a church; and they take pride in Christ's name only.) (3) And they do not allow people to contract only one marriage; even if someone should want

---

[40] Eusebius gives a comparable explanation at H. E. 3.27.1. He knows nothing of an "Ebion."

[41] Cf. Acts 4:34-35.

[42] See p. 133 n. 2.

[43] A shorter version of these "witnesses" is found at Ep. Pet. Ad Jac. 4.1.

to be released from his first marriage and contract another, they permit it—they allow everything without hesitation—down to a second, and a third, and a seventh marriage.

18,4 They acknowledge Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Moses and Aaron—and Joshua the son of Nun[44] simply as Moses' successor, though he is of no importance. But after these they acknowledge no more of the prophets, but even anathematize David and Solomon and make fun of them. Similarly they disregard Isaiah and Jeremiah, Daniel and Ezekiel, Elijah and Elisha; for they pay them no heed and blaspheme their prophecies,[45] but accept only the Gospel. (5) They say, however, that Christ is the prophet of truth[46] and the Christ; <but> is Son of God by promotion,[47] and by union with the elevation on high which has come to him. They say that the prophets are prophets of <their own> understanding, not of truth. (6) Christ alone, they would have it, is prophet, man, Son of God, and Christ—and as I said before he is a mere man[48] who has come to be called Son of God owing to the virtue of his life.

18,7 Nor do they accept Moses' Pentateuch in its entirety; they reject certain sayings.[49] When you say to them, of eating meat, "Why did Abraham serve the angels the calf and the milk? Why did Noah eat meat, and why was he told to by God, who said, 'Slay and eat?' Why did Isaac and Jacob sacrifice to God—Moses too, in the wilderness?" he will disbelieve those things and will say, "What need for me to read what is in the Law, when the Gospel has come?"

18,8 "Well, how do you know about Moses and Abraham? I know you admit that they exist, and that you put them down as righteous, and your own ancestors."

18,9 Then he will answer, "Christ has revealed this to me," and will blaspheme most of the legislation, and Samson, David, Elijah, Samuel, Elisha and the rest.

---

[44] The Book of Joshua is appended to the Samaritan Pentateuch, perhaps for similar reasons.

[45] Ebionites are said to repudiate the canonical prophets at Method. Conviv. 8.10.

[46] This idea recurs many times in the Clementina. A good specimen is found at Rec. 8.59-62.

[47] Hipp. Refut. 7.34.2: καὶ <γὰρ> τὸν Ἰησοῦν λέγουσι δικαιοῦσθαι ποιήσαντα τὸν νόμον, · διὸ καὶ Χριστὸν αὐτὸν <καὶ υἱὸν> θεοῦ ὠνομᾶσθαι.

[48] Clem. Hom. 16.15.2: "Our Lord neither asserted that there were gods except the Creator of all, not did he proclaim himself to be God." This, however, is a late passage by an Anomoean author.

[49] Clem. Hom. 2.38.1; 45-52; 18.19-20. The Clementina regard any anthropopathic material in the Pentateuch as a corruption of the Law God originally gave to Moses.

19,1 But the tramp is completely exposed by the Savior, who refutes the whole of his deceitful teaching, expressly and as though in summary form with one utterance, when he says, "John came in the way of righteousness, neither eating nor drinking, and they say, He hath a devil. The Son of Man came eating and drinking, <and they say, Behold a man gluttonous and a wine-bibber.">[50] (2) And he certainly does not mean that John never by any chance ate, or that the Savior ate anything and everything—with the suspicion of forbidden foods as well. (3) The passage makes the meaning of the truth plain, since "He is a glutton and a wine-bibber" can mean only the eating of meat and the drinking of wine; and "neither eating nor drinking" means that John did not partake of meat and wine, but only of locusts and honey—water too, obviously.

19,4 But who does not know that the Savior arose from the dead and ate (flesh)? As the holy Gospels of the truth say, "There was given unto him bread, and a piece of broiled fish. And he took it, and did eat, and gave to his disciples."[51] As he also did at the Sea of Tiberias, both eating and giving. (5) And a great deal can be said on this subject. But I must now come to the detailed refutation of their worthless, unsound teachings, and compose the rebuttal of them.

20,1 And first, it must be said of Christ that he is not a mere man. It cannot be that a person conceived <like> a man in every respect will be given to the world for a "sign," as the Holy Spirit foretold of him by saying to Ahaz, "Ask thee a sign"; and since Ahaz would not ask, the prophet then said, "The Lord himself shall give you a sign. Behold the Virgin shall conceive."[52]

20,2 A woman who has been united to a husband and married cannot be called a virgin. But she who has truly had the conception of the Word of God without a husband may properly be called a virgin—(3) as Isaiah himself says in another passage, "A voice of a cry from the city, a voice from the temple, a voice of the Lord of recompense, that rendereth recompense to his enemies. Before she that travailed hath brought forth, before the pain of her travail came, she escaped (it) and was delivered of a man child. Who hath heard of such a thing? Or who hath seen such things? Or hath the earth travailed in one day and brought forth a nation at once? For Zion hath travailed and brought forth her children. And it was I who granted this expectation, and they did not remember, saith the

[50] Matt. 11:18-19
[51] Luke 24:42-43; John 21:12
[52] Isa. 7:11;14

Lord."[53] (4) But which "expectation" and which "children," other than that of a virgin's giving birth (to a child) without labor pains, something that had never happened, and that the child born of Elizabeth by promise for his sake <leaped in the womb before his birth>, even though John was born with labor pains.

20,5 How, then, can these people declare the Savior a mere man, conceived of a man's seed? How will he "not be known," as Jeremiah says of him, "He is a man, and yet who will know him?"[54] (6) For in giving his description the prophet said of him, "Who will know him?" But if he were speaking of a mere man, surely his father would know him and his mother, his relatives and neighbors, the members of his household and his fellow townsmen. (7) But since the human offspring is born of Mary but the divine Word came from above, truly begotten not in time and without beginning, not of a man's seed but of the Father on high, and in the last days consenting to enter a virgin's womb and fashioning flesh from her, patterned after himself—this is why Jeremiah says, "And he is a man, but who will know him?"[55] For as God he came from above, the only-begotten divine Word.

20,8 But the deluded souls are most unfortunate to have abandoned the testimonies of prophets and angels and to be content with those of the deluded Ebion, who wants to do what he likes, and practice the Jewish cusoms even though he is estranged from the Jews. (9) <For> when Gabriel was bringing the tidings to Mary, he pledged his word at once as soon as she said, "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?" and said, "The Spirit of the Lord shall come upon thee, and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee. Therefore also that which is born of thee shall be called holy, Son of God."[56] (10) By saying, "that which is born," he showed that the flesh <is> from her and the rest of the humanity, but that the power of the highest and the Holy Spirit overshadowed the holy Virgin from above, from the heavens, and the only-begotten Son, the divine Word, has descended from on high—<indicating> both that Christ became man, and that he was born of her in truth. (11) And how much more there is of this sort! But as I promised it is not my custom to range widely, so as not to make my treatise very lengthy.

---

[53] Isa. 66:6-9
[54] Jerem 17:9
[55] Jerem 17:9
[56] Luke 1:34-35

21,1 But next I shall discuss the other false accusations which they make, against Peter and the other apostles—that every day, before so much as eating bread, Peter had had immersions. (2) Observe the whole of their slander, and the badness hidden under their cheap teaching! Since they are defiled themselves and often indulge themselves sexually on earth, they make lavish use of water for their own reassurance, to deceive themselves if you please, under the impression that they have purification through baptisms. (3) And they are not ashamed to say these offensive things about the apostles, even though the Lord exposes their perversity since, when he came to wash Peter's feet, Peter said, "Thou shalt never wash my feet," and the Savior's answer was, "If I wash not thy feet thou hast no part with me." (4) And when Peter replied, "Not the feet only, but also the head," the Lord returned, "He that is washed once needeth not <to wash> his head, but his feet only; for he is clean every whit."[57]

21,5 He showed, then, that there is no need to make use of immersions, useless customs, and commandments and teachings of men, as he says in the Gospel in agreement with the prophet, "This people honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. But in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."[58] (6) Why did he fault the Pharisees and Scribes, with their thorough immersions <both> of themselves, and of their platters, cups and the rest? And why does he declare definitively, "To eat with unwashen hands defileth not a man?"[59] Thus not only did he put a stop to the immersion of these things. He even showed that washing one's hands is unnecessary, and that if one would rather <not> wash his hands, it does him no harm.

22,1 And how can their stupidity about the eating of meat not be exposed out of hand? First of all, because the Lord ate the Jewish Passover. Now the Jewish Passover was a sheep and unleavened bread—sheep's flesh roasted with fire and eaten, (2) as his disciples say to him, "Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee that thou mayest eat the Passover?" And the Lord himself says, "Go ye into the city, and ye shall find a man bearing a pitcher of water and ye shall follow whithersoever he goeth, and say ye to the goodman of the house, Where is the guest-chamber, where I shall keep the Passover with my disciples? And he shall show you an upper room furnished; there make ready."[60]

---

[57] John 13:8-10
[58] Matt. 15:8-9
[59] Matt. 15:20
[60] Mark 14:12-15

22,3 And again, the Lord himself says, "With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you."[61] And he did not simply say "Passover" but "*this* Passover," so that no one could play with it in his own sense. A Passover, as I said, was meat roasted with fire and the rest. (4) But to destroy deliberately the true passage these people have altered its text—which is evident to everyone from the expressions that accompany it[62]—and represented the disciples as saying, "Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the Passover?" and he supposedly saying, "Did I really desire to eat meat as this Passover with you?"

22,5 But how can their tampering go undetected, when the passage cries out that the "mu" and "eta" are additions? Instead of saying ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα they have put in the additional μή. Christ truly said, "With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you."[63] But they misled themselves by writing in meat and making a false entry, and saying, "Did I really want to eat meat with you as this Passover?" But it is plainly demonstrated that he both kept the Passover, and, as I said, ate meat.

22,6 But they will also be convicted by the vision which was shown St. Peter, through the sheet which contained all sorts of wild beasts, domestic animals, reptiles and birds, and the Lord's voice saying, "Arise, slay and eat!" And when Peter said, "Not so, Lord; nothing common or unclean hath entered into my mouth," the Lord replied, "What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common."[64] (7) For the proof of the truth can be arrived at by two methods. If they say that St. Peter's remark refers inclusively to all foods when he says, "Nothing common or unclean <hath> at any time <entered into my mouth>," so that he would have called cattle, goats, sheep and birds unclean, they will be exposed at once by his previous mode of life. (8) It was after marrying, fathering children[65] and having a mother-in-law that he met the Savior, and he was Jewish. But Jews eat flesh, and among them the eating of meat is not considered abominable or forbidden. (9) Since he had always eaten meat, then—even if we say (he did it only) until he met the Savior—this will prove that he considered nothing unclean which was not declared to be unclean. For in fact he did not attribute commonness or uncleanness to all sorts of meat, but (only) to the ones the Law called common or unclean.

---

[61] Luke 22:15
[62] I.e., the expression τοῦτο.
[63] Luke 22:15
[64] Acts 11:7-9
[65] The Act of Peter, BG 8502,4, is the legend of Peter's daughter.

22,10 But again—since it is established that he did not hold of all kinds of meat that they were all common, but that he held this of the kinds which are called common and unclean in the Law—to teach him the character of Christ's holy church God told him to consider nothing common. "For all things are pure, when they are received with thanks and praise to God."[66] (11) But even though the riddle referred to the call of the gentiles so that Peter would not regard the uncircumcised as profane or unclean, the expression Peter used did not refer to people but meant the foods the Law prohibits, as anyone can see. And their silly argument has failed from every point of view.

23,1 They pretendedly accept the names of the apostles in order to convince their dupes, and have composed forged books in their names, supposedly by James, Matthew, and other disciples. (2) They list the name of the apostle John among these to make their stupidity detectible in every way. For not only does he refute them in every way by saying, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God."[67] (3) <It is clear from his Gospel>, moreover, that he <accepts> the testimonies of the holy prophets. In this Gospel he published their testimonies by giving a good and full account, with the Holy Spirit's help, of the things the Savior said about each oracle (of the prophets) which, as I said, has been fulfilled in Christ. From these prophets the Ebionites have estranged themselves. (4) At the very outset he showed how John himself answered the messengers sent by the Pharisees to John the Baptist with, "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Isaiah."[68] (5) And again, when the Lord overturned the tables of the money-changers and said, "Make not my Father's house an house of merchandise," John himself, taking the testimony from the prophets, I mean from David, said, "They remembered that it was written, The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up."[69] And again, John himself said, "Isaiah saw, being in the Holy Spirit."[70]

24,1 And again, when St. John himself was preaching in Asia, it is reported that he did an extraordinary thing as an example of the truth. Although his way of life was most admirable and appropriate to his apostolic rank and he never bathed, he was compelled to approach the bath by the

---

[66] Cf. Rom. 14:20 and 1 Tim. 4:3.
[67] John 1:1
[68] John 1:23
[69] John 2:16-17
[70] John 12:41

Holy Spirit who said, "Look what is at the bath!" (2) To his companions' surprise he actually went to the bathing-room, approached the attendant who took the bathers' clothes, and asked who was inside in the bathing-room. (3) And the attendant stationed there to watch the clothes—some people do this for a living in the gymnasia—said to St. John, "Ebion is inside." (4) But John understood at once why the Holy Spirit's guidance had impelled him to approach the bath, as I said—as a memorial to leave us the truth's advice as to who Christ's servants and apostles are, and the sons of that same truth, but what the vessels of the evil one are, and the gates of hell; though these cannot prevail against the rock, and God's holy church which is founded on it. (5) Becoming disturbed at once and crying out John said in an aside audible to all—as a testimony in evidence of undefiled doctrine—"Let's get out of here in a hurry, brothers, or the bath may fall and bury us along with the person who is inside in the bathing-room, Ebion, because of his impiety." (6) And no one need be surprised to hear that Ebion met John. The blessed John had a very long life, and survived till the reign of Trajan.[71] (7) But anyone can see that all the apostles distinguished Ebion's faith (from their own), and considered it foreign to the character of their preaching.

25,1 And how much do I have to say about their blasphemies of St. Paul? First, they say that he was Greek and of gentile parentage, but that he had later become a proselyte. (2) Why does he say "an Hebrew of Hebrews" of himself, then, "of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin, concerning the Law, a Pharisee, being more exceeding zealous of the traditions of my fathers?"[72] (3) And he says elsewhere, "Are they Israelites? So am I. Are they the seed of Abraham? So am I,"[73] and, "Circumcised the eighth day, brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, and an Hebrew of Hebrews."[74]

25,4 What frightful shrieks and snake's hisses of the horrid serpents, and what deadly nonsense! Whose word shall I take? Ebion's and his kind, or St. Peter's, who says, "As my brother, Paul, hath written unto you, which things are deep and hard to be understood, which they who are unlearned and unstable pervert by their own ignorance?"[75] (5) And St. Paul himself testifies in his turn for Peter and says, "James, John and Cephas, who seemed

---

[71] Cf. Iren. 3.3.4.
[72] Phil. 3:5; Gal. 1:14
[73] 2 Cor. 11:22
[74] Phil.3:5; Acts 22:3
[75] 2 Pet. 3:15-16

to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship."[76] For even if he said that he was from Tarsus, this is no excuse for the attitude of those who hunt for words <that they have invented> to their own ruin and the ruin of <their> converts. (6) For that matter, scripture also says that Barnabas, whose name was once Joseph but was changed to Barnabas, or "son of consolation," was a Levite from Cyprus. And it is by no means true that, because he was a Cypriote, he was not descended from Levi. Just so, even though St. Paul came from Tarsus, he was not foreign to Israel.

25,7 For since many were dispersed when there was war during the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes and at other times, both by being taken prisoner, and by <fleeing because of> a siege, those who had been taken captive remained in certain places, while everyone who had left for some such reason settled where he could. (8) And so the holy Jeremiah said of Israel because it was so often that they had to flee from their enemies, "And if thou passest over to the Citians, there also shalt thou have no rest."[77] (9) Now anyone can see that Citium means the island of Cyprus, for Cypriotes and Rhodians are Citians. Moreover, the Cypriote and Rhodian stock had settled in Macedonia where Alexander of Macedon came from. And this is why the Book of Maccabees says, "He came out of the land of the Citians";[78] Alexander of Macedon was of Citian descent.

25,10 But to find my place again after giving the information about them because of the chance remark,[79] I am saying that many of the emigrants who had settled in the other countries had Israelite ancestry. (11) For they were called natives of each country besides. Thus Jethro's daughters told their father how Moses had helped them when he drove the shepherds away and watered their sheep. And they went and told their father about it, and when he said, "How is it that ye are come so soon today?" (12) they answered, "An Egyptian delivered us from the shepherds, and also drew water for us and watered our flock." And Jethro answered at once, "Why brought ye him not hither, that he may eat bread?"[80]

25,13 But who does not know that Moses was the son of Amram and Jochabed, Amram was the son of Kohath, Kohath of Levi, Levi of Jacob, Jacob of Isaac, and Isaac of Abraham? And the line of his noble stock and his descent had surely not died out because Moses is called "Egyptian."

---

[76] Gal. 2:9
[77] Isa. 23:12
[78] 1 Macc. 1:1
[79] I.e., at 25,2
[80] Exod. 2:18-20

(14) But these people whom Ebion has led astray have left the road and set their minds on many crooked ways and an uphill path.

26,1 Again, they are proud of having circumcision,[81] and boast, if you please, that this is the sign and mark of the patriarchs and the righteous men who have lived by the Law; and they think that it makes them their equals. And indeed they want to give the proof of this from Christ himself, as Cerinthus did. (2) Echoing his silly argument they too say, "'It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master.' Christ was circumcised; you be circumcised too!"[82]

26,3[83] …and that the seeds of the imposture may be discredited in every way. As the sea has a bridle, bars, and gates determined by God; as it has sand for a boundary, and for a commandment, "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further; in thyself shall thy waves be shattered,"[84] <as> he says—so they will be exhausted within themselves. (4) But there the words about the boundary have been said by God for the ordering of the sea by God's command. Here, however, wickedness, and the imposture that blinds the mind and perverts pious reason, has of itself raised waves against itself beforehand, as it were. It smashes against the harshnesses of its previous pronouncements with other waves of its own opinion, and is constantly being shattered within itself <and> destroying itself.

26,5 Or it is like a horrid serpent which savages itself and becomes its own destruction by bending round from the tail and devouring itself. (6) They say this used to be done by asps which had been sealed up in jars, and when each had destroyed the other the strongest and and fiercest survived. But when it was left alone and got hungry, certain Egyptian naturalists report that it would eat itself up, beginning with its own tail. Hence they also named this appropriately and from the Gorgon's head called this too an "aspidogorgon."[85] (7) So the lame-brained Ebion and his circle have cut themselves up beforehand, and from the outset destroyed the very things of which they are proud. (8) For Christ did not circumcise himself, since he was born as a child. But glory to the merciful God! To avoid admitting the truth Ebion has anticipated himself, so that this even becomes a refutation for him. (9) If he said that Christ had come down from heaven as God and been circumcised by Mary on the eighth day, then—since, as God, he

---

[81] Cf. Iren. 1.26.2.
[82] Cf. PsT 3.3.
[83] There is a lacuna here.
[84] Job 38:11
[85] The word might originally have referred to the Gorgon's head on Athena's breastplate.

would be allowing this of his own consent—this would provide the tramp with the persuasive argument for circumcision. But since he brings in the idea that Christ, as a mere man, was generated by men, the child cannot be responsible, even though he was circumcised the eighth day. (10) For he did not circumcise himself, but was circumcised by men. Children do not circumcise themselves and are not responsible for their own circumcision; their parents are. They are unknowing, innocent babes, and neither do they know what their parents are doing to them.

27,1 But we say that he both came from heaven as God and remained in the Virgin Mary's womb for the normal period of gestation, so as to take his incarnate humanity entirely from the virgin womb, and provide the dispensation in which he was also circumcised—truly, and not in appearance—on the eighth day. (2) "For he came to perfect the Law and prophets, not to destroy them"[86]—not to declare the Law foreign to himself, but a thing given by himself and continuing as a type until his coming. Thus the deficiencies in the Law would in turn be perfected in him and by him so that the types, come to spiritual perfection, might be preached in truth by him and his apostles—no longer as types but as truth.

27,3 For in this the saying of the Law was fulfilled, one which had stood until his time, and was abolished and yet brought to fulfillment in him—the words of Zipporah, "The blood of the circumcision of my child hath ceased to flow."[87] (4) And she did not say, "I was circumcising my child"—the angel who was sent to her was not instituting circumcision, nor did he leave for fear of the blood of circumcision. But in token of the Child who would stanch the blood of circumcision <he was providing that she would say, "The blood of my child hath ceased to flow">. And on hearing this and having made the provision, he went away. (5) And which child's blood, mark you, but the child's of whom the prophet said, "They shall wish that they were burned with fire. For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is also given,"[88] (6) truly referring to the child who was born to mean his true incarnation; but (saying), "Unto us a son is given," to show that God's Word from above and his Son himself had been given and become man by entering the womb—both human and divine, himself God, himself man; himself a Son given from above, himself a child (humanly) born.

27,7 With this child the blood of circumcision finally ceased to flow, as he says in the Gospel—when Greeks arrived to see him, approached

---

[86] Cf. Matt. 5:17.
[87] Cf. Exod. 4:25.
[88] Cf. Isa. 9:5-6.

Philip, and told him, "Show us Jesus," and Philip told John (*sic*) and John told Jesus, "Certain Greeks desire to see thee."[89] (8) And the Lord replied at once, "Now hath come the glory of God," to show that physical circumcision, which had served for a while as a type, was passing away, but that uncircumcision in the flesh possesses a greater circumcision in spirit, since it sees Christ and has comprehended him in truth.

28,1 But if these people choose to say, "Then why was Christ circumcised?"—you misguided souls, I have already told you the reason he was circumcised! He was circumcised for many reasons. (2) First, to prove that <he had> really <taken> flesh, because of Manichaeus and those who say he been manifested (only) in appearance. (3) Then, to show that the body was not consubstantial with the Godhead as Apollinarius says, and that he had not brought it down from above as Valentinus says. (4) And to confirm the circumcision which he had given of old and which had served a legitimate purpose until his arrival; and so that the Jews would have no excuse. For if he had not been circumcised they could have said, "We cannot accept an uncircumcised Christ."

28,5 And besides, after commanding Abraham to be circumcised—circumcised as a visible seal but in token of the true and invisible seal that he had been given—Christ needed to confirm this by being circumcised (himself). (6) For the visible circumcision was instituted because of Abraham's doubt, when the holy and righteous man said, as though in doubt, "Shall a son be born unto him that is an hundred years old?" and, "Shall Sarah in her old age bear a son?"[90] And the Lord said at once, "Take me a ram three years old, and a goat, and an heifer,"[91] and so on, and about sundown, when Abraham saw burning torches, an oven and the rest, (7) and after God reprovingly told him, for a safeguard, "Thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and they shall enslave them for four hundred years,"[92] because of the doubt that had led Abraham to say, "Shall a son be born to him that is an hundred years old?"[93] he imposed physical circumcision on him and his, to keep them from forgetting the God of their fathers after they had been enslaved by idolatrous, unbelieving Egyptians. Thus they would see their circumcision, be reminded and feel abashed, and not deny him.

---

[89] Cf. John 12:20-22.
[90] Gen. 17:17
[91] Gen. 15:9
[92] Gen. 15:13
[93] Gen. 17:17

28,8 And this remained the case until Christ, and because of it he himself consented to be circumcised, and became true man; though he had come from above from the Father as the divine Word, and did not doff the Godhead but truly wore flesh. (9) He was circumcised in the possession of full humanity, making all his provisions in truth—so that the Jews would have no excuse, as I said, and the Manichaeans and others would be refuted and so that, being circumcised himself, he could with reason abolish circumcision and show that another kind was greater. It was not as though he had no circumcision and was making one up for himself. He had one, but showed that there is no further need of this circumcision, but of the greater one.

29,1 And that he was God as soon as he was born and not a mere man, the magi will plainly show. For after a period of two years—as they told Herod the time the star had risen, "two years ago at the most"[94]—they came to Jerusalem. And on learning by inquiry that Christ must be born in Bethlehem, these same magi left again with the star guiding them, and came from Jerusalem to Bethlehem. (2) And they went in and found him with his mother Mary, and fell down and worshiped him and offered their gifts. (3) Now if he is worshiped at the outset, the child who has been born is not a mere man at birth, but is God and does not become Christ thirty years later, and not after the baptism, but was born as Christ of a virgin, God and man. (4) And thus the angels hymn him at once with, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will among men,"[95] and give the shepherds tidings, "Unto you is born this day, in the city of David, Christ the Lord."[96]

29,5 And this is not the only proof, you deluded Ebion! Moreover, when he has turned twelve he is found "sitting in the midst of the priests and elders, both questioning them and disputing with them,"[97] and "They were amazed at the gracious discourse which proceeded out of his mouth."[98] (6) And it was not after his thirtieth year that he was doing this, allowing you to say he became Christ when the Spirit had come to him, but right at the age of twelve as I said, as it is written in the Gospel according to Luke.

29,7 But even earlier too when, during his childhood, when Joseph and Mary went up to Jerusalem to worship at the feast and started back,

---

[94] Matt. 2:16
[95] Luke 2:14
[96] Luke 2:11
[97] Luke 2:48
[98] Luke 4:22

Jesus stayed behind. And they looked for him on the road and among their relatives—Mary had relatives—and could not find him. (8) But she went back and found him, and said, "Son, what hast thou done to us? Behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing." (Joseph was in the position of father to him, for he was not his actual father.) (9) Then the Lord answered her, "Why is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be in my Father's house?"[99] indicating that the Temple had been built in the name of God, that is, of his own Father. (10) Now if he knew the Temple and his Father from childhood, Jesus was not a mere man when he was born and he was not called Christ and Son (only) after his thirtieth year, after the form of the dove had come to him. Instead he was teaching, even at once and with full assurance, that he had to be in his Father's house.

29,11 And for proof that Joseph was not his father but <was> in the position of father, hear how the same evangelist—the one who quotes Mary as saying, "Thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing"[100]—writes in turn, "And Jesus began to be about thirty years of age, being, *as was supposed*, the son of Joseph."[101] By saying, "as was supposed," he showed that Jesus was not his son, but was supposed to be.

30,1 But the time is going to run short for my discussion in proof of the truth and in refutation of Ebion's weak-mindedness and his phony school of weak-mindedness. (2) What does not make it plain that Joseph was not father to Jesus, but was held to be in the position of father? "Behold," scripture says, "the Virgin shall conceive and bear a son";[102] it didn't say, "Behold, the wife!" (3) And again, it says in another place, "And the heifer shall bear, and they shall say, It hath not borne."[103] Some Manichaeans and Marcionites say that Jesus was not born—hence, "She shall bear, and they shall say, She hath not borne." For Mary has not given birth because of a man's seed, and these people[104] madly tell the lie that she has given birth because of a man's seed. The heifer, then, has in truth borne God, in truth borne man.

30,4 And to show that the Virgin is called "heifer" and that what was left by this heifer was a purification of the defiled, hear the Law saying,

---

[99] Luke 2:48-49
[100] Luke 2:48
[101] Luke 3:23
[102] Isa. 7:14
[103] This quotation is from the Apocryphon of Ezekiel. See Charlesworth I, p. 494, Fragment 3.
[104] I.e., the Ebionites

"Take thee a fiery-red heifer,"[105] indicating the chosen vessel of Mary <by saying, "*Take* thee an heifer." But it says, "fiery-red,"> because of the fieriness of the Savior's Godhead that was contained in the Virgin; for "God," says scripture, "is a consuming fire."[106] (5) And the Law says, "a fiery-red heifer upon whose neck hath never come yoke,"[107] to show that the Virgin, who does not know the yoke of marriage to a husband, is a "heifer."

30,6 But why am I giving most of the arguments? As Isaiah, again, said in the person of the Lord, "Take unto thee a sheet cut from a great, new papyrus-roll"[108]—"sheet" because the Virgin is the product of a man's seed but has been cut off from union with men and separated from natural human behavior. (7) For all human beings are generated by man's seed. But while Christ's generation had its humanity naturally from a woman, the Virgin Mary, it was cut off unnaturally from the human line of descent as Jacob says of him, "Thou didst come up, my son, from a shoot."[109] And he didn't say, "Thou didst come up from a seed." (8) And for this reason the holy Isaiah the prophet says, or rather, the Lord says to him, "Take thee a sheet (cut from) a papyrus-roll,"[110] giving a symbol of sexual intercourse, the way in which men write their entire record. As it also says in the hundred and thirty-eighth psalm, "In thy book shall all be written; they shall be fashioned in a day, and no one is in them,"[111] for it likened the womb to a book.

30,9 This is why David says, "Thine eyes did see my unbaked substance."[112] That is, he said, "You knew me after I was conceived but before I was formed; and even earlier, before my conception." (31,1) But the Hebrew author makes the expression marvelously clear. He called the "unbaked substance" a "golem," which means a grain or granule of flour—something which has not yet come together into a loaf and been kneaded, but is like a particle or fleck detached from a grain of wheat, or the tiny speck that is left by fine flour. (2) Thus he precisely represented a thing of the same shape, the particle that is detached from a man for insemination, and said—giving the expression in Greek translation—"the unbaked substance." In other words, he said, "'Thine eyes did see' the

[105] Numb. 19:2
[106] Deut. 4:24
[107] Numb. 19:2
[108] Isa. 8:1
[109] Cf. Gen. 49:9.
[110] Isa. 8:1
[111] Ps. 138:16.
[112] Ps. 138:16

unformed substance still in the womb, or before the womb"—"God knoweth all things before they be,"[113] as scripture says. But what is meant by "book" and "sheet" is "womb."

31,3 And he did not say, "Take thee a roll," or, "Take thee papyrus," but "a piece"—contrary to people's characteristic custom—because of the likeness of the womb to a place for writing. He said, "new," because of the newness and spotlessness of the Virgin. (4) And <"great">; for great indeed is Mary, the holy Virgin, before God and man! How can we not call her "great," when she contained the Uncontainable, whom heaven and earth cannot contain? Yet he, though uncontainable, was contained by his own choice and consent, willingly and not of necessity. Great, then, is the "sheet of papyrus," and new! Great, because of the marvel; new, because virgin.

31,5 "And write on it," he says, "with a man's pen."[114] And he didn't say, "Someone will write on it with a man's pen"; and he didn't say, "A man will write on it" either, so that Ebion would find no opportunity. If he had said, "A man will write on it," Ebion could say that a man, Joseph, sowed, and that Christ was generated from the seed of a man. (6) But he said, "Write!" to Isaiah about 753 years before the event, so that the truth would be apparent to everyone from the length of the interval—since no one could have sired the child who was to be born, 753 years ahead of time. (7) Then did he say, "Write!" to the prophet for no good reason? No, but to show that the Holy Spirit, who was in the prophet, would himself truly become the agent of the incarnate Christ's conception. For, "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and so on"[115] said the angel Gabriel to Mary. (8) But "with a man's pen" means, "in the image of a man." "For Christ Jesus is man, but he is mediator between God and men,"[116] since he came from on high as divine Word but from Mary as man, though not begotten of man's seed.

31,9 And this is why the prophet says at once, "And he went in unto the prophetess,"[117] to show that Mary is a prophetess—not Ahaz's wife as some mistakenly allege that this was said because of Hezekiah. (10) For Hezekiah had already been born eleven years before. For it was in the third year of

---

[113] Susannah 42
[114] Isa. 8:1
[115] Luke 1:35
[116] Cf. 1 Tim. 2:5.
[117] Isa. 8:3

his father's reign that the prophecy, "Behold, the Virgin shall conceive,"[118] was delivered. And after the death of Ahaz, who reigned for fourteen years and (then) died, the scripture says at once, "And Hezekiah began to reign; twenty <and five> years old was he when he began to reign."[119] (11) So how could Hezekiah, (who reigned for twenty years after his father), be born during the reign of his father, who reigned for fourteen years, because of the prophecy that Emmanuel would be born of a virgin? Instead, will it not be evident to the wise that Hezekiah had already been born when the prophet delivered the oracle during the reign of Ahaz, Hezekiah's father? (12) Especially since Ahaz's wife was not a prophetess, as anyone can see. This is Mary, who said prophetically, "For from henceforth all generations will call me blessed";[120] Mary, to whom Gabriel came with the tidings that the Spirit who had spoken in Isaiah would come upon her and she would bear a son, our Lord Jesus Christ, through the Holy Spirit—and not by the seed of a man, as these people foolishly and erroneously blaspheme.

32,1 But both the lame-brain's Sabbath observance and circumcision, and the daily baptisms of which he makes use, stand discredited; for Jesus made a point of healing mostly on the Sabbath. And it was not just that he heals, but that he heals in two ways. (2) He directs the persons he has healed to pick their mattresses up and walk. Moreover, on the Sabbath he made clay and anointed the blind man's eyes, but the making of clay is work. (3) Hence, since the apostles had learned from their association with him and from his teaching that the Sabbath had been abolished, they plucked ears of grain on the Sabbath, rubbed them in their hands and ate them. But it was a "second Sabbath after the first" as the Gospel indicates.

32,4 For the Law designated various Sabbaths. The Sabbath proper, which recurs week by week. And the one that is a Sabbath because of the occurrences every month of the new moons and of the successive feasts such as the days of Tabernacles, and of Passover when they sacrifice the lamb and then eat unleavened bread. Further, when they keep the single, annual fast which is called the "Greater Fast," and the other, which they call the "Lesser." (5) For when these days occur, on the second day of the week or the third or the fourth, this too is designated a Sabbath for them.

32,6 Hence, after the Day of Unleavened Bread which had come and been designated a Sabbath, on the Sabbath proper following the Day of

---

[118] Isa. 7:14
[119] 2 Kms. 18:1-2
[120] Luke 1:48

Unleavened Bread which was considered a Sabbath, the disciples were found going through the standing grain, plucking the ears, and rubbing and eating them. (7) They were proving that the prohibition which is fixed on the Sabbath has been relaxed at the coming of the Great Sabbath—Christ, who gave us rest from our sins, and of whom Noah was a type. On seeing him at birth his father named him Noah by prophecy, and said, "He will give us rest from our sins, or deeds of cruelty."[121]

32,8 But Noah did not give any rest from sins. Lamech made the prophecy of Christ, whose meaning is truly Noah—"Noah" means "rest"—and "Sebeth," which means "rest and Sabbath." (9) In other words, "Christ," in whom the Father and his Holy Spirit have rested, and all holy men have found rest in him by desisting from sins. He is the great, eternal Sabbath, of which the lesser, temporary Sabbath was a type. This served until his coming, had been prescribed by him in the Law, and was abrogated, and fulfilled in him, in the Gospel. For this is what he meant when he said, "The Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath day."[122]

32,10 Hence the disciples broke the Sabbath with confidence—since even the priests before them used to break it in the Temple by sacrificing and offering sacrifices to God, to keep the continual sacrifice that was offered every day from coming to an end. And not only did the priests themselves prophesy the Sabbath's abrogation by not remaining idle; besides, circumcision itself broke the Sabbath.

32,11 For when a child was born on the Sabbath as one often was, there was an abrogation of the Sabbath and of circumcision. Thus the dissolution of both was predicted. Obviously, if the ones who were to circumcise the child which had been born on the Sabbath chose to be exact about the eighth day, and they found that it fell on Sabbath and still circumcised the child, they performed a work and broke the Sabbath. (12) But if they put it off so as not to break the Sabbath, they then performed the circumcision on the ninth day, and violated circumcision itself, and its mandatory term of eight days.

33,1 Nor was the first circumcision final. It was given for a sign, as a reminder of things to come, and because of the holy Abraham's doubts when, as I said, he was reproved for them—and as a type of the Greater Circumcision, which fulfills all things equally in those who are held worthy. (2) If the previous circumcision had been for sanctification and the inher-

---

[121] Cf. Gen. 5:29.
[122] Matt. 12:8

itance of the kingdom of heaven, Sarah would have been deprived of the kingdom—and Rebecca, Leah, Rachel, Jochabed, Miriam the sister of Moses, and all the holy women. They could not have inherited the kingdom of heaven, since they could not have the circumcision of Abraham which, as the Ebionites tell it, God had given him. But if these have not been deprived of the kingdom of heaven though they have no circumcision, the physical circumcision of today is of no force.

33,3 But why does Ebion boast of circumcision, when both the idolaters and the Egyptian priests have it? Moreover the Saracens, also called Ishmaelites, have circumcision, and the Samaritans, Idumaeans and Homerites. Most of these do this, not because of a law, but from some senseless custom.

33,4 And I will simply use a lot of time if I spend it on Ebion's nonsense, because of the way he pointlessly relies on the wording of the Savior's, "It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master,"[123] for his boast that his own circumcision derives from Christ's—which was cut off altogether in him and abolished through him! (5) Still, since the oaf takes this saying of the imitation of Christ, I do not mind showing that it was not said for this reason.

33,6 The Lord explains immediately that he did not say it for this reason but because of persecutions and the way the Jews insulted him, and he says, "If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; if they have hated me, they will hate you also."[124] "Call ye not me teacher and Lord? And ye say well, for so I am.[125] If they have called the master of the house Beelzebul, how much more shall they call them of his household?"[126] (7) And, "The servant cannot be above his lord, nor the disciple above his teacher. But let the disciple be perfect in all things, as his teacher"[127]—in other words, ready for persecution, defamation, and whatever may be inflicted on him. (8) Hence St. Paul too said, "Be ye imitators of me, as I also am of Christ."[128] And it was not that he imitated his Master in a wrong way; he did not say, "I am God," or, "I am the Son of God," or, "I am the divine Word." For he says, "I am the least of the apostles," and, "He was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time."[129]

---

[123] Matt 10:25
[124] John 15:21
[125] John 13:13
[126] Matt. 10:25
[127] Matt. 10:24; Luke 6:40
[128] 1 Cor. 1:11
[129] 1 Cor. 15:8-9

34,1 But if you take this text of the imitation of Christ, Ebion, and want to be as your teacher—or rather, as your Lord—in the circumcision you have such silly ideas <about>, stop being like him in circumcision! This will do you no good. The Lord has made it obsolete, as I have shown plainly through many testimonies. (2) For he came and fulfilled it by giving us the perfect circumcision of his mysteries—not of one member only, but by sealing the entire body and cutting it off from sin. And not by saving one portion of the people, males alone, but by truly sealing the entire Christian people, men and women both, and <leading> them ungrudgingly <on> to the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven. And not by providing the seal defectively in weakness, to only one class, males alone; but by revealing the kingdom of heaven to an entire people through his seal, his commandments, and his good teaching.

34,3 But if you want to be like the Lord, Ebion—that is, if you want to be like the teacher—you are very wrong. Stop mimicking him in circumcision. Call Lazarus from the grave, or raise another dead man; cleanse lepers or grant sight to the blind, or heal a paralytic from birth, if you can! But you can't because you are doing the opposite, imprisoned by unbelief, chains of flesh, and insatiable demands of law. (4) Now if you cannot do even these things—which you cannot, because of your wrong belief—I deny <that you are> like Christ. You cannot become like God, for you are a mortal man, and a deluded one. Nor can you call on Christ's name for miracles—and even if you do, you don't succeed. (5) But if you ever did manage to make a paralytic stand, since he had gotten up by the name of Jesus he could get understanding from him too, so as not to tolerate your Sabbath observance but <be able> to learn, from the name of his Healer, "Take up thy bed and go unto thine house on the Sabbath day.[130]

34,6 But I have already said how each of them palms off something different about Christ. Ebion himself did at one time, by saying that he originated as a mere man from sexual intercourse. But at other times the Ebionites who derive from him say that Christ has a heavenly power from God, "the Son," and that the Son puts Adam on and takes him off when convenient. By the power of God I have refuted their various opinions.

34,7 But why should I spend any further time on tidal beaches by the sea, which are flooded here and dry there, and fish are often stranded on some of them and injure people's feet when they cross their high parts because of there being poisonous ones among them—I mean sting-rays,

[130] Mark 2:11; John 3:8-16

sea-snakes, sharks and sea-eels—as I have just now said. (8) I shall leave this spot in its turn, thanking God that I have also put this sect to flight, not half-heartedly but even with a painstaking refutation. (9) But let us address ourselves to others next, beloved, praying for God's help, that he himself may bring our undertakings to fulfillment through me.

31.

Against Valentinians[1]

also called Gnostics. Number eleven, but thirty-one of the series

1,1 After these so-called Ebionites I shall go on to the sect of the Valentinians. For I have made my way through the Ebionites' wickedness, and have promised <to refute> the others that follow by the power of God, although they have the faces of other wild beasts and the poisons, bites and venom of serpents—all the things that are visible, as in a gaping maw; in their teachings—and <the ways> of a fire-breathing dragon, or of a horrid serpent and basilisk. I shall give the best refutation I can of the Valentinians, the people who also title themselves Gnostics. (2) There are ten varieties of Gnostic, each as afflicted as the other with one plague of dreams about their syzygies, ogdoads, and male and female aeons. I shall no longer arrange the treatise by the times of the (sects') succession, but (simply) pass from one to the other.

1,3 For all of these sprouted from the ground at the same time like toadstools and all came to life at once like stunted, smelly shoots and thistly grass and like a den full of scorpions, and, as I said, appeared in an instant like the ugliness of toadstools. This has been said of them already, by the most holy Irenaeus.[2] (4) For they all arose simultaneously but, although it had borrowed its poor excuse (for existing) from the other, each one wanted <to find> even more than the other, and each, for ostentation, had already

---

[1] Sect 31 is largely dependent upon Irenaeus; 9,1-32,8 are taken verbatim from Iren. Praef.-1.11.1. However, 5,3-56,1 reproduce an otherwise unknown Valentinian source. The details of Valentinus' biography are drawn from oral information.

The earliest mention of Valentinians is found at Justin Dial. 35.6. Tertullian's tractate *Adversus Valentianos* is dependent upon Irenaeus. PsT 4.1-6 is very like Irenaeus but differences in detail suggest that it might represent Hipp. Synt. Fil. 38 seems to combine material from Hipp. Refut. with Hipp. Synt. and may show a knowledge of Epiph. Hipp. Refut. 6,29.21-36 and the NHC *Tripartite Tractate* (I,5) and document XI,2 of NHC are independent of any sources we know. Epiph uses neither, but they have various points of contact with him and Irenaeus.

[2] See Iren. 1.29.1.

devised its own variety of wicked invention. (5) And they all called themselves Gnostics, I mean Valentinus and the Gnostics before him, as well as Basilides, Satornilus and Colorbasus, Ptolemy and Secundus, Carpocrates, and many more.

1,6 But though I have named them all here because the emergence of all of them and their rotten <teaching> came at once, I am still going to discuss the perversity of each one's sowing by itself. For the present I shall go to the heresiarch and tragedian before us, I mean to Valentinus and his teaching, a part of this overall "Gnostic" subject <which is full> of contemptible silliness, as it is found contemptible and ridiculous by the wise.

2,1 Valentinus is the successor of the ones I have placed before him—Basilides and Satornilus, and Ebion, Cerinthus, Merinthus and the others. For all these sprang up evilly in the world at the same time; or rather, Cerinthus, Merinthus and Ebion did a little earlier. For (the Valentinians) grew up along with the ones I have already presented before them.

2,2 Most people do not know Valentinus' homeland or birthplace; to give his birthplace has not been an easy business for any writer. But I have heard a report as though by word of mouth; therefore I shall not overlook it, and though I cannot give his birthplace—to be honest, it is a disputed point—I shall not be be silent about the rumor that has reached me. (3) Some have said he was born a Phrebonite, a native of Paralia in Egypt, and received the Greek education in Alexandria.

2,4 And so, in imitation of Hesiod's Theogony <and> the thirty so-called gods that are mentioned by Hesiod himself, Valentinus, who had memorized the heathen mythological poetry and adopted the notion from those who had lost the truth in his time and before it, wanted to deceive the world with material just like Hesiod's by changing the names into different ones. (5) For he too wants to introduce thirty gods, aeons, and heavens. The first of these is "Depth"—as he himself foolishly said the sort of thing which of course Hesiod, the originator of his idea, had said: "Chaos is the eldest of the gods."[3] But who can fail to see that "chaos" and "depth" mean the same thing?

2,6 But look at the tramp's overblown mythology and his poor teaching! As I said, this man wants to set 30 aeons, whom he also calls gods, side by side, and says that there are 15 males and as many females. (7) He and his school say that each aeon is male and female, and a pair; they say that there

[3] Hesiod Theogony 116. For the comparison of Valentinus' teaching with Hesiod see Iren. 2.14.1f (though Irenaeus says Antiphanes instead of Hesiod). Hipp. Refut. compares it instead with Pythagoras.

are 15 pairs, which they call "syzygies." Altogether there are 30 aeons, and each female brings forth the next aeons with the male as their sire. They are as below, with each male's name placed opposite the female's, side by side: (8) Ampsiou Auraan, Boukoua Thardouou, Ouboukoua Thardeddein, Merexa Atar, Barba Oudouak, Esten Ouananin, Lamertarde Athames, Soumin Allora, Koubiatha Danadaria, Dammo Oren, Lanaphek Oudinphek, Emphiboche Barra, Assiou Ache, Belim Dexiarche, Masemon.

2,9 That is how they are arranged in pairs of male and female. But in consecutive order they go, Ampsiou, Auraan, Boukoua, Thardouou, Ouboukoua, Thardeddein, Merexa, Atar, Barba, Oudouak, Esten, Ouananin, Lamertarde, Athames, Soumin, Allora, Koubiatha, Danadaria, Dammo, Oren, Lanaphek, Oudinphek, Emphiboche, Barra, Assiou, Ache, Belim, Dexiarche, Masemon.[4]

2,10 The translations of these names are,[5] Depth <and> Silence. Mind and Truth. Word and Life. Man and Church. Advocate and Faith. Paternal and Hope. Maternal and Love. Ever-Mindful and Understanding. Desired—also called Light—and Blessedness. Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom. Profound and Mingling. Ageless and Union. Self-Engendered and Blending. Only-Begotten and Unity. Immoveable and Pleasure. (11) Counted in consecutive order from the highest, unnameable being whom they call Father and Depth, to our heaven, the tally of the thirty aeons is, Depth, Silence, Mind, Truth, Word, Life, Man, Church, Advocate, Faith, Paternal, Hope, Maternal, Love, Ever-Mindful, Understanding, Desired—also called Light—Blessedness, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, Profound, Mingling, Ageless, Union, Self-Engendered, Blending, Only-Begotten, Unity, Immoveable, Pleasure.

3,1 And this is their mythological romance of the thirty aeons, and their nonsense of a supposed "spiritual Pleroma" in pairs![6] (2) If, by way of comparison, one were to set it beside the one in Hesiod, Stesichorus, and the other Greek poets, he would find that, put parallel, they are precisely the same, and would learn from this that the leaders of these systems are professing to speak in mysteries about nothing that is remarkable. (3) They have done nothing else than to copy the pretended poetic art of the

---

[4] There are only 29 "names"; either a word has fallen out, or Epiphanius has miscounted. The text of Epiphanius actually gives 33 words, of which Holl eliminated four as duplications. The sense is irrecoverable; Holl suggests sthat the whole may have been a Hebrew or Aramaic prayer or the like, which has been corrupted into unintelligibility.

[5] This list is identical with the one found at Hipp. Refut. 6.29-30.

[6] Iren. 1l.13. See n. 9.

Greeks' imposture and heathen mythology, changing nothing except for their altered foreign coinage. (4) For the school of Hesiod too says as follows: First of all comes "Chaos"—(by which they mean "Depth)." Then Night, Erebus, Earth, Aether, Day, Passion, Skill, Destiny, Woe, Lot, Retribution, Reproach, Friendship, Death, Lawlessness, Age, Bane, Desire, Oblivion, Sleep, Combat, Allayer of Care, Arrogance, Kindly, Radiance, Ender of Care, Deceit, Sweet-Singing, Strife.[7]

3,5 And put like this, this consecutive tally of males and females totals thirty. However, if one should wish to see how they artificially unite one to one, he would find the ones that the poets thought appropriate united and coupled as follows. (6) For example, by uniting Depth with Night and Silence, they provided for the birth of Earth. But others say that Heaven, the one they have also called Hyperion—that he was united with Earth and has sired males and females, and the rest, similarly, in succession throughout their whole poem, as the endless, silly nonsense of the myth has it.

3,7 He would find that they are united and coupled like this, and can be put in the following order: Chaos, Night. Erebus, Earth. Aether, Day. Passion, Skill. Destiny, Woe. Lot, Retribution. Reproach, Friendship. Death, Lawlessness. Age, Bane. Desire, Oblivion. Sleep, Combat. Allayer of Care, Arrogance. Kindly, Radiance. Ender of Care, Deceit. Sweet-Singing, Strife. (8) And if one were to study their fabrication, and had a mind to find out how—because they were vainly inspired <to> inappropiate things by the secular Greek poets who left them dazed—<they altered (the poets') error> into labor in vain and trouble for nothing, he would find that they are that much further astray.

4,1 And so they thought that by supposedly searching still higher they could discover a Defect too, through their own demon-possesed thinking. This Defect they call Almighty and Demiurge,[8] and the creator of substances.[9] (2) They say that a latter Ogdoad with seven heavens, patterned

---

[7] Of the above, only the first eight correspond with the names given at Theogony 116-125.

[8] For "Demiurge" in NHC see Tri. Trac. 104,32-106,5; Ascl. 73,24-26; 75,13-15; Silv. 100,3-14; Val. Exp. 37,32; 38,25; 39,16.

[9] To equate the Demiurge with "Defect" Epiph may here have combined Iren. 1.5.2 with 1.16.3: factorem caeli et terrae…ex altera labe facta emissum…Cf. Tert. Adv. Val. 18.1. ὑστέρημα, "defect," may also be translated "deficiency." However, Defect is not a person in any known Gnostic document. The noun occurs in 16 NHC tractates and in the Cod. Tch. Let. Pet. and Gos. Jud., usually meaning the lack of something, or incompleteness or faultiness. The filling of it is a key idea in Gos. Tr., see 16,31-17,4; 18,31-19,10; 24,55-26,39; cf. Apocry. Jas. 3,34-4,22. A few times the term stands for the entire realm outside the pleroma, e.g. at NHC VIII,2 Let. Pet. 135,15-20: And when she spoke the Arrogant One

after the first Ogdoad, has been created by him in its turn, and he is in the Ogdoad himself, and has made seven heavens after him[10] (3) To this Defect they propose to join an unattached aeon with no female which has come here from the Pleroma in search of the soul which has come from above, from its mother Sophia whose name they like to imagine and represent as Achamoth. Him they <want> to call Savior, Limit, Cross, Limit-Setter, Conductor, and the Jesus[11] who passed through Mary like water through a conduit.[12] (4) He is a light from the Christ on high, and is therefore named Light for his father, after the Light on high; Christ, after the Christ on high; Word, after the Word on high—and is likewise termed Mind <and> Savior. (5) He is constantly ascending above his father the Demiurge, and bringing any who trust in him with him, to the supernal syzygies of the Pleroma[13]

4,6 What foolishness of theirs, and silly talk to match! But as I said, I am also going to show how they combined their drivel with the poetic fabrications of heathen mythology. (7) For after the thirty, <Hesiod and the others also introduce> the one name which stands in the middle and has no female with it; and after it again, the Ogdoad in pairs which is derived from the Demiurge. It too can be set side by side as follows, and these are the names: The first, Exepaphus.[14] Porphyrion, Clotho, Rhyacus, Lachesis, Epiphaon, Atropus, Hyperion, Asterope.

4,8 And this is the stage-piece of these poets. It also contains many other names of what they call gods, male and female, variously named by various of them. They can even make a total of 365,[15] and they are still dreamed of as an occasion for the other sects, which have mounted this tragic piece in their turn. (9) For after the names we have mentioned, Hesiod, Orpheus, Stesichorus and the others say that Uranus and Tartarus have

---

laid hold of (a piece of Sophia), and it became a deficiency (= Cod.Tch. 1 3,24-27). For this meaning cf. Tri. Trac. 81,8-10; 84,5; Or. Wld. 103,25-27; 124,5-7. At the non-Gnostic Silv. 101,31-34 it means the created world.

[10] Cf. Iren. 1.5.2: Et propter hoc Ebdomadum vocant eum, Matrem aut Achamoth Ogodada, servantem numerum primogenitae Pleromatis Ogdoadis. Hebdomad and Ogdoad are also proper names at Hipp. 6.31-37.

[11] Epiph here erroneously makes Jesus a name for Limit, and combines Limit's restoration of Sophia with Savior's restoration of Achamoth at Iren. 1.4.5. With the whole, cf. Hipp. 6.31.5-6; Tert. Adv. Val. 10.3; Exc. Theod. 35.1; 42.1-3; Tri. Trac. 75,10-17; 76, 31-34; 82,10-11. For an almost lyrical presentation of Limit see Val. Exp. 25,22-37. Also note Mand PB 256 (Drowyer p. 213). Limit does not descend to earth in any known Gnostic work.

[12] Iren. 1.7.2; PsT 4.5; Test Tr. 45,14-16

[13] Cf. Gr. Seth 57,7-11.

[14] I.e., Exepaphus is the aeon without a female. Eight names follow, "the ogdoad."

[15] See n. 6 p. 78.

come into being and Cronus and Rhea; Zeus, Hera and Apollo; Poseidon and Pluto, and then any number of what they call <gods>. For a great deal of deceitful error arose from their speculation, and it conceived nonsense and invented many myths to write poems about. (10) And this is the error which appears to be deceiving the minds of these deluded (Valentinians). But everyone with godly enlightenment of mind will find these things ridiculous at first sight.

4,11 But passing over these things, once again <following> the passages from their own books word for word and expression for expression, I am going to give the text of the literature they read, I mean their book. It is as follows:

5,1 "Greeting from <unsearchable>, indestructible Mind to the indestructible among the discerning, the soulish, the fleshly, the worldly, and in the presence of the Majesty![16]

5,2 "I make mention before you of mysteries unnameable, ineffable, and supercelestial, not to be comprehended by principalities, authorities, subordinates or all commingled, but manifest to the Ennoia of the Changeless alone.

5,3 "When, <in> the beginning, the Self-Progenitor[17] himself encompassed all things within himself, though they were within him in ignorance[18]—he whom some call ageless Aeon, ever renewed, both male and female,[19] who encompasses all and is yet unencompassed[20]—(4) then the Ennoia within him (softened the Majesty). Her some have called Ennoia, others, Grace,[21] but properly—since she has furnished treasures of the Majesty to those who are of the Majesty—those who have spoken the truth have termed her Silence,[22] since the Majesty has accomplished all things by reflection without speech.[23] (5) Wishing to break eternal bonds,[24] the

---

[16] μέγεθος or its Coptic equivalent occurs in NHC as a name for the Supreme Being at Apocry. Jas. 15,25-26; Gr. Seth 57,8; Para. Shem 1,6 and *passim*.

[17] See n. 50 p. 100.

[18] Cf. Gos. Tr. 22,27-33; Tri. Trac. 60, 1-34; 72,19-24.

[19] Depth is both male and female at Iren. 1.11.5. Perhaps comparable is Ascl. 20-21 (Festugière pp. 320-323).

[20] Eug. 73,6-9; SJC 96,1-3

[21] Iren. 1.1.1; 1.13.2. For an hypostatized Grace in NHC see Apocry. Jas. 1,5; Apocry. Jn. 4,8; 8,2-8; Gos. Egyp. III,2 52,3-16 and possibly Treat. Res. 45,13.

[22] For Silence in NHC see Apocry. Jn. 40,10-13; Gos. Egyp. III,2 40,18; 41,10 and *passim*; Eug. 88,5-11; SJC 112,7-10; Tri. Prot. 46,13.

[23] Almost the same statement is made at Eug. 88,7-11; SJC 112,9-10; Exc. Theod. 7.1-3. Cf. Such Manichaean passages as Man. Keph. 116,13.

[24] Tri. Trac. 57,26-27: "Yet (the Son) wanted (his fruit) to be known."

imperishable <Ennoia>, as I said, softened[25] the Majesty to a desire for his repose. And by coupling with him she showed forth the Father of Truth whom the perfect have properly termed Man, since he was the antitype of the Ingenerate who was before him.

5,6 "Thereafter Silence, having brought about a natural union of Light with Man[26]—though their coming together was the will for it—showed forth Truth. She was properly named Truth by the perfect, for she was truly like her own mother, Silence—this being the desire of Silence, that the apportionment of the lights of male and female be equal so that the <oneness> which is in them might also be made manifest, through themselves, to the ones which were separated[27] from them as perceptible lights.

5,7 "Thereafter Truth, having manifested a wantonness[28] like her mother's, softened her own Father toward her. They were united in immortal intercourse and ageless union, and showed forth a spiritual tetrad, male and female, a copy of the tetrad already existent, (which was Depth, Silence, Father and Truth).[29] Now this is the tetrad which stems from the Father and Truth: Man, Church, Word, and Life.[30]

5,8 "Then, by the will of the all-encompassing Depth, Man and Church, remembering their father's words, came together and showed forth a dodecad[31] of male and female wantons.[32] The males are Advocate, Paternal, Maternal, Ever-Mindful, Desired—that is, Light—Ecclesiasticus; the females, Faith, Hope, Love, Understanding, Blessed One, Wisdom.

5,9 "Next Word and Life, themselves transforming the gift of union, had congress with each other—though their congress was the will for it—and by coming together showed forth a decad of wantons,[33] they too male and female. The males are Profound, Ageless, Self-Engendered, Only-Begotten, Immoveable. These obtained their names <to> the glory of the All-Encompassing. The females are Copulation, Uniting, Intercourse, Union, and Pleasure. They obtained their names to the glory of Silence.

---

[25] For ἐθήλυνε

[26] Cf. the expression "man of light" which is common in Gnostic and comparable literature; for example at GT 24 and *passim* in PS.

[27] Cf. Exc. Theod. 36.2.

[28] προυνικίαν.

[29] Cf. Iren. 1.1.1; Hipp. Refut. 6.29.5-7.

[30] Cf. Iren. 1.1.1; Hipp. Refut. 6.29.5-7.

[31] The dodecad is mentioned without naming its members.

[32] προυνίκων. Amidon renders: procreative powers.

[33] Cf. Iren. 1.1.2 and Hipp. Refut. 6.30.1-5. At Val. Exp. 30,16-20 the decad and dodecad are προυνίκων.

6,1 "On the completion[34] of the triacad headed by the Father of Truth, which the earthly count without comprehension and go back and count again whenever they encounter it, having yet to find the sum[35]—but it is Depth, Silence, Father, Truth, Man, Church, Word, Life, Advocate, Paternal, Maternal, Ever-Mindful, Desired, Ecclesiasticus, Faith, Hope, Love, Understanding, Blessed One, Wisdom, Profound, Ageless, Self-Engendered, Only-Begotten, Immoveable, Copulation, Uniting, Intercourse, Union, and Pleasure—(2) then he who encompasses all things by unsurpassible understanding, decreeing that another Ogdoad be named in correspondence with the principal Ogdoad which already existed, which was to remain in the Thirty—for it was not the Majesty's intent to be counted—matched with the males (of the first Ogdoad) the males Sole, Third, Fifth and Seventh—and the females Dyad, Tetrad, Hexad and Ogdoad. (3) This Ogdoad, named in correspondence with the prior Ogdoad—Depth, Father, Man, Word, and Silence, Truth, Church and Life—was united with the lights and became a completed Triacad.

6,4[36] "And the prior Ogdoad <was> at rest. But Depth went forth with the support of the Majesty to be united with the multitude of the Triacad. For he consorted with Truth, and the Father of Truth came together with Church, and Maternal had Life to wife, and Advocate had Henad, and Henad was joined with the Father of Truth, and the Father of Truth was with Silence. But the spiritual Word consorted with . . . by spiritual intercourse and immortal commingling, for the Self-Progenitor was at last rendering his rest indivisible.

6,5 "Thus the Triacad, having completed profound mysteries, having consummated marriage among immortals, showed forth imperishable lights[37] These were termed children of the Intermediate Region[38] and—since they lacked intelligence—were without distinguishing features, reposing uncon-

---

[34] For the completion of the thirty see also Val. Exp. 30,16-20.

[35] Or, with Amidon: and when they reach it, finding no further number go back and count up to it again. For the thought cf. 1 Apoc. Jas 27,1-5: "If you want to give (the 72 heavens) a number now, you will not be able to do so until you cast away from yourself blind thought, this bond of flesh which encircles you." Cf. Cod. Tch. James 13,5-23.

[36] With 6,4 cf. Tri. Trac. 68,26-28: "(the Totalities) were drawn into a mingling and a combination and a unity with one another."

[37] Four great lights are elaborately named at Apocry. Jn. II,1 7,30-8,21; there, they are conscious.

[38] For the common μεσότης see, e.g., Para. Shem 6,13; 13,16-17; PS 2.84 (McDermot p. 188); 2.86 (p. 197). At Gos. Phil. 66,8-16;76,33-36 the "middle" is an undesirable state between "this world" and "the resurrection."

scious without an Ennoia. One who treats of this, unless he understands it in its entirety, is not treating of it.[39]

6,6 "Then, after the emergence of the lights whose vast number one need not count individually but must understand—(for each has been allotted its own name for the knowledge of ineffable mysteries)—(7) Silence, desirous of bringing all things in safety to the election of knowledge, consorted by immortal intercourse but intellectual desire with the second Ogdoad which answers to the first. Now her intellectual desire was the Holy Spirit which is in the midst of the holy churches. By sending this, then, to the second Ogdoad, she persuaded it too to be united with her. (8) Marriage was thus consummated in the regions of the Ogdoad, with Holy Spirit united with Sole, Dyad with Third, Third with Hexad, Ogdoad with Seventh, Seventh with Dyad, and Hexad with Fifth. (9) The whole Ogdoad came together with ageless pleasure and immortal intercourse—for there was no separation from one another and their commingling was with blameless pleasure—and showed forth a Pentad of wantons without females. Their names are, Emancipator, Limit-Setter, Thankworthy, Free-Roaming, Conductor. These were termed sons of the Intermediate Region.

6,10 "I would have you know: Ampsiou, Auraan, Boukoua, Thardouou, Ouboukoua, Thardeddein, Merexa, Atar, Barba, Oudouak, Esten, Ouananin, Lamertarde, Athames, Soumin, Allora, Koubiatha, Danadaria, Dammo, Oren, Lanaphek, Oudinphek, Emphiboche, Barra, Assiou, Ache, Belim, Dexiarche, Masemon." This ends the extract I have made <from> their literature.

7,1 Valentinus also preached in Egypt so that, like the remains of a viper's bones, his seed is still left in Athribitis, Prosopitis, Arsinoitis, Thebais and in Lower Egypt, in Paralia and Alexandria. Moreover, he came to Rome and preached. (2) But on reaching Cyprus—<and> really suffering an actual shipwreck—he abandoned the faith and became perverted in mind. For before this, in those other places, he was thought to have a bit of piety and right faith. But on Cyprus he finally reached the ultimate degree of impiety, and sank himself in this wickedness which is proclaimed by him.

7,3 As I said, both he and his school call our Lord Jesus Christ Savior, Christ, Word, Cross, Conductor, Limit-Setter and Limit. (4) But they say he has brought his body down from above and passed through the Virgin Mary like water through a pipe. He has taken nothing from the virgin

[39] Amidon: For whatever one does, unless one understands it completely, one does not do it.

womb, but has his body from above, as I said.[40] (5) They claim that he is not the original Word; nor the Christ after the Word, who is above among the aeons on high, but that this Christ has been emitted for no other reason than just[41] to come and rescue the spiritual race that is from above.

7,6 They deny the resurrection of the dead, and make some mythological, silly claim that it is not this body which rises, but another which comes out of it, the one they call "spiritual."[42] <There is salvation> only of those "spiritual" persons who are their community and of the others, <the> so-called "soulish," provided that the soulish practice righteousness. But the ones they call "material," "fleshly," and "earthly" perish altogether and cannot be saved at all.[43] (7) Each essence returns to its own origins[44]—the material is abandoned to matter, and the fleshly and earthly to the earth.

7,8 For they believe in three classes[45] of persons: spiritual, soulish and material. They say that they are the spiritual class—as well as "Gnostics"—and have no need of work, but only of knowledge and the incantations of their mysteries. Each of them may do anything with impunity and think nothing of it; they say they will be saved in any case, since their class is spiritual. (9) But the other class of humanity, which they call soulish, cannot be saved of itself unless it saves itself by work and the practice of righteousness. But they say that the material class of humanity can neither contain knowledge, nor receive it even if a person of this class might want to, but must perish body and soul.

7,10 Since their own class is spiritual it is saved with another body, something deep inside them, which they imagine and call a "spiritual body." (11) But the soulish, after working hard and rising above the Demiurge, will be given, on high, to the angels[46] who are with Christ. They recover no part of their bodies; just their souls are given as brides to the angels with Christ, when they are found to possess full knowledge and to have risen above the Demiurge.

8,1 Such is the dramatic piece they offer, and it contains even more than this. I have merely enumerated the things I thought naturally needed to be brought to light as far as I have learned about them—(2) where he came from, when he lived, from whom he took his cue, what his teaching

---

[40] Cf. Pst 4.5; Fil. 38.6.
[41] Cf. Hipp. Refut. 6.36.3-4.
[42] Iren. 3.4.3; Tert. Praescr. 30; Adv. Val. 4
[43] Cf. Iren. 1.6.1; 7.5; Tri. Trac. 106,6-18.
[44] Cf. Gos. Phil. 53,20-21.
[45] A Manichaean variation on this theme is found at Man. Keph. 269, 17-25.
[46] This is a slip on Epiph's part, since at Iren. 1.7.5 this is said of the spiritual.

is, together with which contemporaries his evil sprouted up in the world. And as I said, I give his teaching in part. Having related these few things thus far, for the rest I shall take the quotation in full from the man I have spoken of, a servant of God, I mean Irenaeus:

From the Writings of St. Irenaeus[47]

9,1 Certain persons have rejected the truth and are introducing novel falsehoods and "endless genealogies which," as the apostle says, "minister questions rather than godly edifying which is in faith."[48] With the specious argument they have villainously hammered together, they are misleading the minds of the simple and take them captive, (2) tampering with the oracles of the Lord and becoming bad expositors of things that have been said well. And they are overthrowing many by leading them away, under the pretense of knowledge, from him who framed and ordered this whole creation, as though they had something higher and greater to display than the God who has made heaven, earth, and everything in them. (3) Persuasively, through the art of rhetoric, they win the innocent to the habit of inquiry,. But they abruptly[49] destroy them by making their opinion of the Creator blasphemous and impious—since they have no ability to distinguish truth from falsehood in anything.

9,4 For error is not shown as it is lest it become detectible when stripped. Villainously decked in a cloak of plausibility, it presents to the simple the appearance of being truer than the truth itself—<an absurd thing even to say!>—by its outward show. (5) As has been said of such persons by a greater man than I, when a piece of glass is artificially made to resemble the stone which is the real precious pearl and of very great value, it will mock some people, if no one there is competent to test it and expose the wicked trick. And when bronze is mixed with silver, what guileless person can readily assay it?

9,6 Now I have read the treatises of the "disciples of Valentinus," as they say themselves, and have met some and understood what they think. To see that—even through no fault of mine—none are snatched away like sheep by wolves since they may not recognize under their outer covering of lambskin the persons the Lord has warned us of, who speak as <we> do but think otherwise, (7) I feel it essential, beloved, that I disclose to you

[47] 9,1-32,1 are quoted directly from Iren. Praef.-1.11.1.
[48] 1 Tim 1:4
[49] ἀπιθανῶς contrasted with πιθανῶς above.

the monstrous, abstruse mysteries which "all cannot receive,"[50] since all have not spat their brains out! Thus when you have learned them too you can make them known to all who are with you, and urge them to beware of the abyss of folly and blasphemy of God.

9,8 And as far as I can I shall also give a brief, clear explanation of the doctrine of those—I mean the Ptolemaeans—who are now repeating the same teaching, a culling from the school of Valentinus, and give <others> the resources for its refutation, by showing, as well as my modest ability allows, that what they say is absurd, untenable, and incompatible with the truth. (9) This though I am neither accustomed to composition nor trained in rhetoric—even while love bids me disclose, to you and to all who are with you, the teachings that have been concealed till now, but by God's grace have now come to light. "For there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed, and hid, that shall not be known."[51]

10,1 As I live among Celts and chiefly occupy myself with a barbarian language, you will not look for rhetoric, which I have not learned, from me—or ability at composition, in which I have no practice, or elegance of style, or persuasiveness, of which I know nothing. (2) Instead you will accept with love what I have written you with love, simply, truly, and in everyday speech, and grow it yourself—as you can, being abler than I—as though you had received seeds and shoots from me. (3) In the breadth of your intellect you will make what I have said in brief bear fruit in abundance and will present powerfully, to those who are with you, the things I have feebly told you. (4) And as I have done my best—since you have been wanting to learn of their doctrine for a long time—not only to make it known to you but also to provide the means of proving its falsity, you too, by the grace the Lord has given you, will do your best to convey it to the rest, so that people may no longer be swept away with their specious argument, which runs as follows:

10,5 They say that, in invisible, heights that cannot be named, there pre-exists a perfect Aeon. Him they call Prior Principle, First Progenitor,[52] and Depth.[53] He is uncontainable and invisible, eternal and ingenerate, and has existed in calm and deep tranquility[54] for boundless ages of time. And with him also is an Ennoia, whom they term both Grace and Silence.[55]

---

[50] Matt 19:11
[51] Matt 10:26
[52] Eug. 74,21-23: "the Lord of the Universe is not rightly called 'Father,' but προπάτωρ."
[53] At Hipp. Refut. 6.30.7 the Father is ῥίζα καὶ βάθος καὶ βύθος.
[54] Hipp. "Refut. 6.29.5: ἀναπαυόμενος αὐτὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ
[55] "Silence" is found with no alternative name at Hipp. Refut. 6.29.3.

10,6[56] At some time Depth conceived of emitting a first principle of all things from himself, and like a seed[57] he deposited the emanation he had conceived of emitting <in> his co-existent Silence, as in a womb. (7) Receiving this seed and becoming pregnant, Silence brought forth Mind,[58] the like and equal of the One who had emitted him and alone capable of containing the Father's majesty. This Mind they also call Only-Begotten, and Father and first principle of all things. (8) But with him Truth has been emitted, and this is the first, original Pythagorean tetrad,[59] which they also call the root of all things. For it is Depth and Silence, and then Mind and Truth.

10,9 Realizing why he had been emitted, this Only-Begotten himself emitted Word and Life:[60] the father of all who were to come after him, and the principle and form of the entire Pleroma. But from Word and Life, Man and Church have been emitted as a pair.[61] (10) And this is the original Ogdoad, the root and ground of all things, which they call by four names, Depth, Mind, Word, and Man. (For each is male and female as follows: First Progenitor, to begin with, is united in a pair with his own Ennoia. Only-Begotten, or Mind, is united with Truth, Word with Life, and Man with Church.)

10,11 After these Aeons had been emitted to the glory of the Father, they too desired to glorify him with something of their own,[62] and put forth emanations in pairs. Word and Life emitted ten other Aeons after the emission of Man and Church, and they say their names are as follows: Profound and Copulation, Ageless and Union, Self-Engendered and Pleasure, Immoveable and Intercourse, Only-Begotten and Happiness. These are <the> ten Aeons they claim have been emitted by Word and Life.[63]

10,12 But Man too, with Church, emitted twelve Aeons.[64] They favor these with the names of Advocate and Truth, Paternal and Hope, Maternal and Love, Ever-Mindful and Understanding, Ecclesiasticus and Blessedness, Desired and Wisdom.

---

[56] With 10,6-11 cf. Tert. Praescrip. 33. With 10,6-12 cf. PsT 4.1 and Fil. 38.3-4.

[57] There are 13 occurrences of "seed" in Tri. Trac. Particularly significant examples are found at 60,29-37; 61,1-8.

[58] "Mind" appears in this role at Val. Exp. 22,31-36; 23,31-37; 24, 19-22.

[59] This Tetrad also appears at Val. Exp. 29,26-37.

[60] For Life in a comparable role see Val. Exp. 24,21-22; for Word and Life, Val. Exp. 29,26-37.

[61] Cf. Val. Exp. 29,28; 31,36-37.

[62] With this idea cf. Tri. Trac. 68,3-5.

[63] Cf. Val. Exp. 30,16-17.

[64] Cf. Val. Exp. 30,18-19.

10,13 These are the 30 Aeons of their imposture, which have been kept secret and are not known. This is their invisible, spiritual Pleroma, with its triple division into ogdoad, decad and dodecad. (14) And for this reason they say that the Savior—they prefer not to call him "Lord"—did nothing openly for 30 years, giving indication of the mystery of these Aeons. (15) Moreover, they say, these 30 Aeons are made very plainly known in the parable of the laborers sent into the vineyard,[65] For some are sent about the first hour, some about the third, some about the sixth, some about the ninth, and others about the eleventh. If you add these hours they give a total of 30—one, three, six, nine and eleven are 30—and they hold that the Aeons are made known by the hours. (16) And these are the great, marvelous, ineffable mysteries which they produce—and, of the things the scriptures say in great quantity, these are all that could be matched and compared with their fabrication.

11,1 They say their First Progenitor is known only to Only-Begotten, that is to Mind, who originated from him.[66] To all the rest he is invisible and incomprehensible.[67] Only Mind, they believe, enjoyed the contemplation of the Father and rejoiced in the perception of his immeasurable greatness. (2) And he intended to communicate the greatness of the Father to the remaining Aeons,[68] what he was like and how great he was, and how he was without beginning, uncontainable and impossible to see. But by the Father's will Silence restrained him, because she meant to arouse them all to an intent and yearning to seek after their First Progenitor.[69]

11,3 Similarly the other Aeons also had a sort of silent yearning to see the originator of their seed, and be informed of their root which had no beginning.[70] (4) But the Aeon which was by far the last and the youngest of the twelve emitted by Man and Church—that is, Sophia[71]—sprang forth,

---

[65] Matt 20:1-16. At Apocry. Jas. 8,8-9 it is implied that only the author's community knows the true sense of this parable.

[66] Cf. Apocry. Jn. II,1 4,19-26.

[67] Cf. Tri. Trac. 60,16-29.

[68] A comparable role is played by the Father himself at Tri. Trac. 61,1-9.

[69] The Father himself does this at Tri. Trac. 65,11-17; 71,35-72,10.

[70] The aeons' search for their origin is also mentioned, e.g., at Gos. Tr. 17,4-13; Tri. Trac. 61,24-28; 71,7-11. At U 2.12 (MacDermot p. 229) the "outside worlds" desire to "see" the Father.

[71] Sophia is found as a name nearly 100 times in NHC. Versions of the story of her fall appear at On Res. 46,35-37; Apocry. Jn. III,1 14,9-15,22; Nat. Arc. 94,1-18; Cod. Tch. James 21,12-15; PS 1.31 (McDermot pp. 45-46) and at Zost. 9,16-10,17 though this latter passage is mutilated. Gr. Seth 50,25-51,20 is related, and cf. *Ginza 78,25-28.* Often Sophia is absolved of blame. At 1 Apoc. Jas. not she but Achamoth is at fault. At Gos. Egyp. III,2 56,22-57,13 Sophia appears when Eleleth speaks and Sakla and Nebruel are brought out

and without a union with her consort,[72] Desired, experienced a passion which had begun in Mind and Truth and fallen suddenly upon this errant Aeon—pretendedly a passion of love, but (actually) one of presumption, since she did not have perfect fellowship with the Father as Mind did.

11,5 Then, since she could not (find the Father) because she had set herself an impossible task, and since she had fallen into deep distress[73] at the vastness of the depth, the Father's unsearchability, and her love for him, she stretched farther and farther forward. And she would finally have been engulfed and utterly dissolved by his sweetness[74] if she had not encountered the power which makes all things firm, and keeps watch over them outside of the ineffable majesty. (6) This power they call Limit.[75] Restrained and made fast by Limit,[76] coming to herself with difficulty, and convinced of the Father's incomprehensibility, she abandoned her former Resolve, with the passion inspired by that terror-stricken wonder.

12,1 But some of them speak of Sophia's passion and conversion in terms of the following myth. In her attempt at something impossible and unattainable she gave birth to an essence without form,[77] such a nature as a female could bear.[78] (2) On observing it she was first grieved at the unfinished character of its birth,[79] then afraid that its very existence might come to an end as well—then distraught and at her wits' end, from searching for the cause of what had happened, and how to hide it. (3) But after her submergence in the passions[80] she experienced conversion and tried to return to the Father; and after some time in this venture was exhausted, and became the Father's suppliant.[81] (4) The other Aeons, and especially Mind,

---

of her. At Or. Wld. 98,11-99,2 the difficulty is caused by her shadow; at Gos. Tr. 16,5-20 by "the Totalities"' ignorance. At Tri. Trac. 74,17-80,11 the protagonist is the Logos, not Sophia, and he is held to be blameless.

[72] At Hipp. Refut. 6.30.6-9 Sophia's fault is, not that she desires to attain the Father, but that she desires to emulate him by reproducing without a consort.

[73] Cf. Gos. Tr. 17,10-11; Tri. Trac. 77,11-36.

[74] For the Father's "sweetness" cf. Tri. Trac. 77,11-27.

[75] See Hipp. Refut. 6.32.5-6; Tri. Trac. 75,10-17; 76,31-34; 82,10-11. For an almost lyrical presentation of Limit see Val. Exp. 25,22-37.

[76] Cf. PsT 4.2.

[77] Material related to this is found at Hipp. Refut. 6.30.9; Gos. Tr. 17,10-36; Tri. Trac. 78,8-17; 95,2-6; Apocry. Jn. 9,25-10,19; Orig. Wld. 99,3-100,28; Zost. 9,16-17; *Ginza* 78,25-28.

[78] The female parent contributes only its matter to the offspring, while the male contributes its form; cf. Hipp. Refut. 6.30.8.

[79] In Mandaean literature Rucha d'Qudsha, the Mandaean equivalent of Sophia, often laments the imperfection of her offspring, e.g. at *Ginza* 100,31,1-101,5.

[80] Cf. Val. Exp. 33,35-37; 34,26-28.

[81] Cf. Hipp. Refut. 6.31.1-2; Tri. Trac. 81,8-82,9; Apocry. Jn. 14,1-5. Her prayer of

joined in her supplication.[82] From this, they say, the essence of matter had its first origin: from the ignorance, grief, fear and distraction (of Sophia).

12,5 It was for this reason that the Father emitted Limit in his own image, unpartnered and with no female, through Only-Begotten. (They sometimes conceive of the Father as paired with Silence, but sometimes as above both male and female.)[83] (6) They call this Limit Cross, Redeemer, Emancipator, Limit-Setter, and Conductor.[84] They say that Sophia was purified and made firm by Limit, and restored to her syzygy.[85] (7) For now that her Resolve, with the passion[86] which had arisen later, was separated from her, she remained within the Pleroma. But her Resolve, with the passion, was separated and fenced off by Limit,[87] and once outside him was a spiritual essence <like> a sort of natural germ of an Aeon, but shapeless and without form because it understood nothing. And for this reason they call it a sterile fruit and a female.

13,1 But after its banishment outside the Pleroma of the Aeons, and the restoration to her syzygy of its mother, in order that no Aeon would suffer as she had, by the Father's forethought Only-Begotten emitted yet another pair to fix the Pleroma and make it firm, Christ and Holy Spirit, by whom, <they say>, the Aeons were settled.[88] (2) For Christ taught them the nature of union, (that is), that <only those> who comprehend the ingenerate <are fit for union> with him;[89] and to proclaim among themselves their realization that the Father is uncontainable and incomprehensible and cannot be seen or heard, or that he is known only through Only-Begotten—(3) also that the incomprehensibility of the Father is the cause of the others' eternal endurance, while the cause of their birth and formation is his comprehensibility, that is, his Son. And the newly emitted Christ performed this work among them.

---

repentance is given at Val. Exp. 34,25-31. Gos. Egyp.III,2 hypostatizes a Metanoia which "fills up" the deficiency (59,10-18), resulting in the repentance of "the seed of the archon of this aeon" and others (54,21-60,2).

[82] Cf.Tri. Trac. 86,4-15.

[83] Cf. Hipp. Refut. 6.29.3-4. For Limit in NHC see Tri. Trac. 76,31-34; 82,10-13; Val. Exp. 25,22-24; 26,31-34; 27,30-38.

[84] Cf. Hipp. Refut. 6.30.5-6 and the list of names for the "cross of light" at Acts of John 98 (H-S II p. 185).

[85] Cf PS 2.74 (MacDermot p. 166); Man. Keph. 72,3-6; *Ginza* 311,37-312,9; *Johannesbuch* 36,10-37,4 et al.

[86] For "passion" cf. Tri. Trac. 95,2-6.

[87] The cross plays a comparable role at Test. Tr. 40,25-29.

[88] Hipp. Refut. 6.31.2-3; Gos. Tr. 24,9-20; Tri. Trac. 73,1-8.

[89] Something like this is done by Spirit at Tri. Trac. 71,35-72,19; 73,1-8.

13,4 But after they had all been made equal, Holy Spirit taught them to give thanks and explained the true repose.[90] And thus, they say, the Aeons were made alike in form and sentiment, and all became Minds, all Words, all Men, and all Christs; and similarly the females all became Truths, all Lives, all Spirits and all Churches. (5) But when all things had been fixed in this state, they say, and were perfectly in repose, they hymned the First Progenitor with great joy because they partook of great happiness.

13,6 And in return for this benefit, with one will and purpose each of the whole Pleroma of Aeons, with the consent of Christ and Holy Spirit and with their Father's endorsement, pooled and contributed what was best and brightest in it. Fitly combining these things and becomingly uniting them, (7) they produced an emanation to the honor and glory of Depth,[91] a kind of consummate beauty and star of the Pleroma, its perfect Fruit, Jesus.[92] He is also called Savior; Christ; Word after his father; and All,[93] because he is of all. And angels[94] of the same nature were emitted with him in <his> honor, to be his bodyguard.

14,1 This, then, is the affair they say took place within the Pleroma; and the misfortune of the Aeon who suffered and almost perished when she <experienced> deep <grief> because of her search for the Father; and her solidification after her ordeal by Limit-Cross-Redeemer-Emancipator-Limit-Setter- Conductor; and the production, because of her repentance, of the first Christ and Holy Spirit, later than the Aeons, by their Father; and the joint production, by public subscription, of the second Christ, whom they also term Savior. (2) These things have not been said openly since not everyone can accommodate the knowledge of them, but they have been made known mystically by the Savior in parables to those who can understand them, as follows: (3) The thirty Aeons are made known, as we said, by the thirty years in which they claim the Savior did nothing openly; and by the parable of the laborers in the vineyard. (4) And they say that Paul often names these Aeons very plainly, and further that he has even observed their order by saying, "unto all the generations of the aeons of the aeon."[95]

---

[90] Cf. The "rest" of the aeons at Tri. Trac. 70,18. More usually in this tractate, "rest" refers to the salvation of an individual. On the subject see Helderman, *Anapausis*.

[91] Cf. Tri. Trac. 86,4-87,17; Corp. Herm. 13.2: ἄλλος ἔσται ὁ γεννώμενος θεοῦ θεὸς παῖς, τὸ πᾶν ἐν πᾶσιν ἐκ πάσων δυνάμεων συνεστώς.

[92] Hipp. Refut. 6.31.1-2.

[93] Cf. Silv. 101,22-26; 102,5; GT 77; Acts of Peter 39 (H-S II p. 316); Corp. Herm. 13. 2.

[94] A more sophisticated version of this is found at Tri. Trac. 87,17-31. Cf. also Apocry. Jn. II,1 8,20-25.

[95] Eph 3:21

(5) Moreover, we too are giving indication of those Aeons when we say, "unto the aeons of the aeons,"[96] at the eucharist. And wherever "aeon" or "aeons" are mentioned, they hold that the reference is to those.

14,6 The emission of the dodecad of Aeons is made known through the Lord's disputation with the doctors of the Law at the age of twelve, and by his choice of the apostles, for there are twelve apostles. (7) And the remaining eighteen Aeons are shown by the fact that, as they say, the Lord spent eighteen months with the disciples after his rising <from> the dead. Moreover, the eighteen Aeons are plainly made known by the first two letters of his name, "iota" and "eta." (8) And they say that the ten Aeons are similarly indicated by the "iota" which begins his name. And this is why the Savior has said, "One iota or one tittle shall not pass away till all things come to pass."[97]

14,9 The passion encountered by the twelfth Aeon is suggested, they say, by the defection of Judas who was the twelfth of the apostles, and because (the Savior) suffered in the twelfth month—they hold that he preached for one year after his baptism. (10) Further, this is shown very clearly in the incident of the woman with the issue of blood. For after suffering for twelve years she was healed by the Savior's arrival, through touching the hem of his garment. And the Savior said, "Who touched me?"[98] for this reason, to teach his disciples of the mystery that had been consummated among the Aeons, and the healing of the Aeon that suffered. (11) For the woman who suffered for twelve years is that power, <which> would have been <completely> dissolved, as they say, by her stretching and the endless running of her essence, if she had not touched the Son's garment—that is, the Truth of the first Tetrad, who is indicated by the hem of the garment. But she stopped this and was rid of the passion. For the power of the Son which issued forth—they hold that this is Limit—healed her, and separated the passion from her.

14,12 And that Savior, the product of all, is the All, is shown, they say, by the words, "All the males[99] that open the womb."[100] For since he is the All, he opened the womb of the suffering Aeon's Resolve, <who> was banished outside the Pleroma, the one they also call a second Ogdoad of whom I shall speak a little later. (13) And they say that, "And he is all,"[101]

---

[96] For the phrase see Tri. Trac. 67,38-68,2.
[97] Matt 5:19
[98] Mark 5:30
[99] That is, πᾶν ἄρρεν
[100] Luke 2:23
[101] Luke 2:23

was obviously said on this account by Paul, and again, "All are for him, and of him are all,"[102] and, "In him dwelleth all the Pleroma of the Godhead."[103] And they interpret, "to gather all in one in Christ, through God,"[104] <in this sense>, and anything else of the kind.

15,1 Then they declare of their Limit, the one they call by a number of names, that he has two activities, the stabilizing and the divisive.[105] Insofar as he stabilizes and makes firm, he is Cross; but insofar as he divides and separates, he is Limit. (2) They say the Savior has made his activities known in the following ways. First the stabilizing, with the words, "He who doth not bear his cross and follow me, cannot be my disciple,"[106] and <again>, "Take up thy cross and follow me."[107] (3) But his divisive activity with the words, "I came not to send peace, but a sword."[108] John too, they say, has made the same thing known by saying, "The fan is in his hand. He will throughly purge his floor, and will gather the wheat into his garner; but the chaff he will burn with fire unquenchable."[109] (4) And with this he has made the Limit's activity known. For they interpret that "fan" as the cross, which consumes everything material as fire consumes chaff, and yet winnows the saved as the fan winnows wheat. (5) But they say the apostle Paul has also mentioned this cross with these words: "For the preaching of Cross is to them that perish foolishness, but unto them that are saved he is a power of God,"[110] and again, "God forbid that I should glory in anything save in the Cross of Christ, through whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world."[111]

15,6 They say this sort of thing about their Pleroma and their fictitious account of all things, and forcibly harmonize things which have been said well with things which they have invented badly. And not only do they try to produce their proofs from the Gospels and apostolic writings, by twisting the meanings and tampering with the interpretations. (Even) more cleverly, and guilefully, they adapt <what they like> from the Law and prophets to their fabrication—(7) since these have numerous parables and allegories

---

[102] Cf. Rom 11:36.
[103] Col 2:9
[104] Eph 1:10
[105] See Val. Exp. 25,22-24; 26,31-34, and especially 27,30-37, where Limit is given four powers rather than two.
[106] Luke 14:27
[107] Cf. Mark 8:34 parr.
[108] Matt 10:34
[109] Matt 10:34
[110] 1 Cor 1:18
[111] Gal 6:14

which can be stretched to mean many things owing to the doubtfulness of their interpretation—and they capture from the truth those who are not keeping careful guard on their faith in one God, the Father almighty, and one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God.

16,1 But what they say is outside the Pleroma is something like this. When the Resolve of the heavenly Sophia, whom they also call Achamoth,[112] had been separated, with the passion,[113] from the <supernal> Pleroma, they say that of necessity she was stranded in a shadowy, empty region.[114] For she found herself outside of the light and Pleroma, without shape and form like an untimely birth, because she had understood nothing. (2) But the <higher> Christ, pitying her and reaching out to her through the Cross, gave her form by his own power—only essential form, not the form of knowledge. After doing this he withdrew by contracting his power and left <her>, so that she would realize the passion she had incurred by separation from the Pleroma and would long for the things that are best—[115] since she had a certain savor of immortality, left <her> by Christ and Holy Spirit. (3) Hence she is given both names: Sophia, after her father—for Sophia is said to be her "father"—and Holy Spirit, after the Spirit who is with Christ.

16,4 Formed and become conscious, but immediately emptied of the Word, or Christ, who had been with her invisibly, she started up in search of the light that had left her—and could not overtake it, because of her obstruction by Limit.[116] And here, to prevent her from starting forward, Limit said, "Iao!"[117] This, they claim, is the origin of the name, Iao.

16,5 Unable to pass Limit because of her entanglement with the passion, and left alone outside, she fell victim to every portion of the passion in its many and various forms. She suffered grief because she had not overtaken the light; fear that, as light had left her, so would life; and desperation besides, and she was altogether in ignorance. (6) And unlike her

---

[112] Achamoth transliterates the Aramaic חכימותא, "Sophia." She appears in NHC and similar literature at 1 Apoc. Jas. 34,3; 35,5-13; 36,5; Cod. Tch. James 21,4;26; 22,7. Gos. Phil. 60,10-15 distinguishes between "Echamoth" and "Echmut."

[113] With this "passion" cf. the "passions" at Tri. Trac. 95,2-6.

[114] Cf. The rehabilitation of ἡ ἐξω Σοφία at Hipp. Refut. 6.32.2-5 and Apocry. Jn. II,1 13,32-14,13. See also Val. Exp. 26,22-26.

[115] At Tri. Trac. 65,1-17 the Father "sows" in the aeons "that [they] might seek after him." Later, at 83,16-27, the Logos "sows" "a pre-disposition to seek and pray to the glorious pre-existent one" in his "defective offspring."

[116] Cf. Val. Exp. 33,25-32.

[117] Cf. PsT 4.2 Jesus cries "Iao" three times at PS 4.136 (MacDermot p. 353). Or. Wld. 101,9-15 explains the name as baby talk addressed to the child of Yaltabaoth.

mother the first Sophia Aeon, she had, not an alternation of the passions but a conflict between them. But another disposition had come upon her as well—that of conversion[118] to the one who had brought her to life.

16,7 They say that she has become the origin and essence of the matter of which this world is composed. The entire soul of the world and the Demiurge has originated from the conversion, while the rest has arisen from the fear and the grief. Everything wet has come from her tears, everything bright from her laughter; and the world's physical components from her grief and terror.[119] (8) For at times, as they say, she would weep and grieve at being left alone in the dark and void, but sometimes she would recall the light that had forsaken her,[120] and she would interrupt her weeping, and laugh.[121] Again, she was sometimes afraid, at other times at her wits' end and distraught.[122]

17,1 But why go on? There would be a lot of dramatics here next and display, with each of them proudly explaining in a different way from which passion the essence of which element has had its origin. (2) Indeed, it makes sense to me that they do not care to teach these things openly to everyone—just to those who can afford to pay even high prices for mysteries of such sublimity![123] (3) For these are no longer like the ones of which our Lord has said, "Freely ye have received, freely give."[124] They are recondite, monstrous, deep mysteries, obtainable with great effort by those who love lies. (4) For who would not spend all he has to learn that seas, springs, rivers, and everything wet has originated from the tears of the suffering Aeon's Resolve, but the light from her laughter, and the world's physical components from her terror and perplexity?

17,5 But I wish to make a contribution of my own to their harvest. Since I see that some water—springs, rivers, rain and the like—is fresh, while sea-water is salt, I presume that not all water has emanated from her tears, for tears are of a salty quality. (6) It is plain, then, that it is this salt water that comes from the tears. But it is likely that, since she fell into great

---

[118] Cf. the conversion of Sophia at Hipp. Refut. 6.32.2-5, at Val. Exp. 34,10-34, and at Tri. Trac. 81,8-82,9. See also the repentance and prayers of Pistis Sophia at PS 1.32 (MacDermot pp. 46-52) and *passim* in this document.

[119] Cf. Hipp. Refut. 6.32.6-8.

[120] Cf. Tri. Trac. 81,30-82,9.

[121] Cf. Sophia's laughter at Val. Exp. 34,34-39.

[122] Cf. Hipp. Refut. 6.31.2-6; PsT 4.3.

[123] The imparting of teachings or mysteries for payment is forbidden at Apocry. Jn. II,1 31,34-37.

[124] Matt. 10:8

anguish and perplexity, she perspired as well. Therefore, on their hypothesis it must be supposed that springs and rivers, and any other fresh water, has its origin from her <sweat>. (7) For since tears are of one quality, it is not credible that fresh water on the one hand, and salt on the other, issues from them. This is more credible, that the one is from the tears and the other from the sweat. (8) <However>, since certain kinds of water are both hot and bitter, you should understand what she did to emit those, and from which part of her. These are the sorts of conclusion that are in keeping with their premise!

17,9 When their Mother had passed through all the passions and barely surmounted them, they say that she addressed herself to supplication of the light, or Christ, who had left her. As he had gone back to the Pleroma he was probably reluctant to come down a second time himself. But he sent Advocate <to> her—that is, Savior—(10) after the Father had put all power in him and put all under his authority, and the Aeons had done the same, so that "all things might be created in him, visible and invisible, thrones, godheads, dominions."[125]

17,11 So he was sent to her, with his angelic companions.[126] They say that at first, out of respect for him, Achamoth veiled herself in modesty. But then, seeing him with all his bounty, she ran to him, having drawn strength from his appearing. (12) He for his part gave her the form of knowledge[127] and effected the cure of her passions by separating them from her. He did not ignore them—they could not be destroyed like the former Sophia's passions, because they were already habitual and strong.[128] But by the separation of them he set them apart, mixed and solidified them, and from incorporeal passions changed them into incorporeal matter. (13) Then he endowed them with fitness and a nature so that they became compounds and bodies, for the generation of two essences, the inferior one <made from> the passions, and the affective one made from the conversion. For this reason too they say that Savior has done the work of creation with power.[129]

17,14 When Achamoth had got free of the passion and joyfully caught sight of the lights which were with him[130]—that is, of the angels who

---

[125] Col 1:16

[126] Cf. Hipp. Refut. 6.32.4; Tri. Trac. 87,17-31.

[127] Cf. Tri. Trac. 62,1-3.

[128] From this point through 17,13 cf. Val. Exp. 35,30-37.

[129] Tri. Trac. 96,35-97,5: "thus he beautified the Kingdom . . . which is filled with the holy spirits and [the] mighty powers which govern them, which the Logos produced and established in power." PsT 4.4 assigns this role to Limit.

[130] Cf. Tri. Trac. 95,35-36: the coming of the Savior and of those who are with him."

were with him—they teach that she conceived fruit in <their> image by yearning for them, a spiritual embryo conceived in the likeness of Savior's bodyguards.

18,1 Since these three things, as they believe, were now in existence—the one which came from the passion, which was matter; the one which came from the conversion, which was the soulish; and the one which she had conceived, the spiritual—her next concern was their formation. (2) But she could not form the spiritual, since it was of her own nature.[131] Instead she addressed herself to the forming of the soulish essence which had arisen from her conversion, and emitted the things she had learned from Savior. (3) And first, they say, from the soulish essence she formed the Father and King of all things[132]—the things of his own nature, the soulish things they call "right"—and of the things which arose from the passion and matter, the things they call "left." (4) For they say that <he> formed everything after him, instigated by the Mother without knowing it. Thus they call him Male-and-Female Progenitor, Without Progenitor, Demiurge, and Father, and say he is father of those on the right, the soulish; demiurge of those on the left, the material; but king of them all. (5) For they say that, because Resolve wanted to create all things in honor of the Aeons, she has made their images—or rather, Savior has made them through her. She herself has preserved <the image> of the invisible Father, since she is not known by the Demiurge. He, however, has preserved the image of the Only-begotten Son; and the archangels and angels he has made, that of the remaining Aeons.

18,6 Thus, as maker of everything soulish and material, they say he has become Father and God of the things outside the Pleroma. For by separating the two commingled essences and making corporeal things from incorporeal, he has created everything heavenly and earthly, and become Demiurge of material and soulish, right and left, heavy and light, upward-tending and downward-tending. (7) For they say that he has constructed seven heavens and is their Demiurge above them. And so they call him Hebdomad; but the Mother, Achamoth, they call Ogdoad[133] so that she preserves the number of the original, first Ogdoad of the Pleroma. (8) But they say the seven heavens are intelligible ones, and suppose that they are angels. The Demiurge himself is an angel, but like a god. And thus they

---

[131] ὁμοούσιον

[132] At Tri. Trac. 100, 19-30 the Logos appoints a supreme archon who is "Father," "God," "king," "demiurge" etc.

[133] See n. 00 p. 00 [Ogdoad]

also say that since Paradise is above a third heaven it has the significance of a fourth archangel, and that Adam received something from it while he lived in it.

18,9 They claim that the Demiurge thought that he makes these things <entirely> by himself,[134] but that he has made them because Achamoth has emitted them. <For> he has made heaven without knowing heaven, formed man though ignorant of man, and produced earth with no knowledge of earth. (10) And in every case they similarly say that he did not know the forms of the things he was making or the Mother herself, but supposed that he alone was all things. (11) But they claim that the Mother has been the cause of this creative activity of his because she wished to prefer him in this way, though she is the source and origin of her own being and the "lord" of the whole affair. (12) They call her Mother and Ogdoad, and Sophia, Earth, Jerusalem, Holy Spirit and, in the masculine, Lord. She inhabits the Intermediate Region[135] and is above the Demiurge, but is below, or outside, the Pleroma until the consummation.

19,1 Since they say that the material essence is composed of three passions—fear, grief and perplexity—the soulish has originated from the fear and the conversion. (2) They hold that the Demiurge has his origin from the conversion, but everything else that is soulish, such as the souls of brute beasts, wild creatures and men, has theirs from the fear. (3) <And> thus, because he is too weak to know spiritual things, the Demiurge has supposed that he alone is God and has said, through the prophets, "I am God, there is none besides me."[136]

19,4 They teach that wicked spiritual beings[137] have come from the grief. This is the origin of the Devil, whom they also call Ruler of the World,[138] and of demons, angels, and anything spiritual that is wicked. (5) But they say the Demiurge is a soulish son of their Mother, while the Ruler of the World is a creature of the Demiurge. And the Ruler of the World knows what is above him, for he is a wicked spirit; but the Demiurge, being soulish, does not.[139] (6) Their Mother dwells in the place above the

---

[134] At Hipp. Refut. 6.33.1 she creates through the Demiurge, who is unaware of her work; in NHC see Tri. Trac. 100,36-101,5; 105,29-35; Apocry. Jn. II,1 19,15-33. There is something comparable in Mandaean literature cf. *Ginza* 266,18-24.

[135] For the μεσότης see n. 140.

[136] Hipp. Refut. 6.33.1, and see n. 11 p. 87.

[137] Cf. Eph. 6:12.

[138] Isa 45:21; cf. Hipp. 6.33.1. For the Κοσμοκράτωρ in NHC see Gr. Seth 52,27; 53,28; 55,3; Zost. 1,18.

[139] Cf. Tri. Trac. 79,12-16.

heavens, the Intermediate Region;[140] the Demiurge in the heavenly place, the Hebdomad; <but> the Ruler of the World, in our world.

19,7 As I said, the world's physical components are derived from the consternation and bewilderment, the more distracted (passions)—earth answering to the motionlessness of consternation, water to the movement of fear, air to the fixity of pain. But they teach that fire is inherent in them all as death and decay, just as ignorance lies concealed within the three passions.

19,8 After creating the world the Demiurge also made the man of dust—not by taking him from this dry earth but from the invisible essence, the overflow and runoff of matter. Into him, they declare, he breathed soulishness. (9) And this is the man created "in an image and a likeness";[141] and in an image he is the material man, very like God but not of the same nature. But "in likeness" he is the soulish man; thus his essence is also said to be a "spirit of life" since it originates from a spiritual effluent. (10) Later, they say, the garment of skin was put on him; this they hold to be the man with perceptible flesh.

19,11 But they say the Demiurge is also unknowing of their Mother Achamoth's spiritual embryo which she brought forth at the sight of the angels about Savior, of the same spiritual nature as the Mother. Nor does the Demiurge know that it has been implanted in him surreptitiously, without his knowledge, so as to be sown through him in the soul which stems from him and in this material body, to be incubated <and> grown in these, and become ready for the reception of mature <Reason>.[142] (12) Thus, they say, the Demiurge was unaware of the spiritual man whom Sophia also sowed, with ineffable <power and> providence, through his breath.[143] For as he knew nothing of the Mother, so he knew nothing of her seed[144]—the

---

[140] Μεσότης. The term appears to be used in this sense at Gos. Phil. 76,36. It is common in Para. Shem, see 6,13; 13,16-17; 14,19;27; 15,21 etc. but in these cases may mean the material world. The μεσότης of Jesus is found at Gr. Seth 66,7-8.

[141] Gen. 1:26

[142] τοῦ τελείου <Λόγου>. For the education of "the seeds" see Val. Exp. 37,20-31; of the "members" of the "perfect man" to prepare them for restoration to the Pleroma, see Tri. Trac. 123,3-22. In Mandaean literature cf. *Ginza* 482,22-483,14; *Johannesbuch* 120,5-7 et al.

[143] Comparable are the powers breathed into the mixture that becomes the soul at PS 3.131 (MacDermot pp. 336-337). Cf also the "hidden Adam" which is mentioned at *Ginza* 486,14-35.

[144] "Seed" in this sense often appears in the Valentinian tractates of NHC, as, e.g., at Gos. Tr. 43,10-14; Tri. Trac. 91,25-32; 95,16-38; 96,19-32; 101,9-14 and Val. Exp. 37,20-35; 40,18-19. Perhaps see also Apocry. Jn. II,1 20,8-24; 30,11-14; Nat. Arc. 96,19-32; 97,5-9;31; Or. Wld. 117,21; Let. Pet. 136,16-18. For the "seed of Seth" see p. 278 n. 2.

seed which they also call Church,[145] a type of the Church on high.[146] (13) They regard this as the man within them,[147] so that they have their soul from the Demiurge, their body of earth and its fleshliness from matter, but their spiritual man from the Mother, Achamoth.[148]

20,1 Since there are three principles,[149] they say that the material, which they also call "left," must perish from its inability to receive any breath of immortality. But the soulish, which they also term "right," being midway[150] between spiritual and material, goes whichever way it is inclined.[151] (2) The spiritual, however, has been sent out to be formed here in conjunction with the soulish,[152] and educated with it in the course of life.[153] And they say that this is the salt,[154] and the light of the world.[155] For the soulish was in need even of perceptible means of instruction; they say that this is why a world has been made. (3) And the Savior has also come for this soulish principle, to save it, since it too has power of self-determination.

20,4 They claim that the Savior has received the first-fruits[156] of the principles he was to rescue. He has received spirituality from Achamoth, has donned the soulish Christ from the Demiurge,[157] and from the dispensation has been clothed with a body the essence of which is soulish but which, by an ineffable art, has been made to become visible, tangible and passible. But they say he has received nothing material at all;[158] matter is not susceptible of salvation.

---

[145] "Church" in this sense is found at Tri. Trac. 93,30-94,22.

[146] The pre-existent, heavenly ἐκκλησία is important in Tri. Trac. and Gr. Seth. It is explained at length at Tri. Trac. 93,20-94,23; see also 58,29-33; 97,5-9 et al and Gr. Seth 50,1-10; 51,14-26 (observe the context); 60,23-25; 65,33-36;8,13-16, and also Eug. 86,18-87,4.

[147] For "inner man" cf. Let. Pet. 137,18-22; Cod. Tch. Let. Pet. 6,1-3.

[148] Comparable accounts of the composition of man are found at the non-Gnostic Silv. 92,10-29; Acts of Thomas 165 (H-S II p. 404).

[149] There are very full accounts of these at Tri. Trac. 103,13-104,3; 106,7-18; 118,14-124,25. At Or. Wld. 117,28-118,2; at 122,7-9 there are three Adams: a material, a soulish and a spiritual.

[150] At Tri. Trac. 103,19-22 the "powers of ambition" are said to be "set in the middle area."

[151] Cf. Tri. Trac. 119,20-24.

[152] The spirit and soul are said to be saved together at Apocry. Jas. 11,39-12,5 and, in Mandaean literature, at *Ginza* 566,18-567,23; 583,2; 587,22 et al.

[153] Cf. Tri. Trac. 123,3-22.

[154] Sophia is called salt at Gos. Phil. 59,30-34. Cf. Matt. 5:13.

[155] Cf. Matt 5:14

[156] Cf. Test. Tr. 32,22-24.

[157] So at Hipp. Refut. 6.35.6, which attributes this doctrine to an "Italian" school of Valentinians. Note also the δημιουργικὴ τέχνη which at 6.35.7 is identified with "the power of the Highest.".

[158] PsT 4.5:…in substantia corporis nostri non fuisse sed spiritale nescio quod corpus de caelo deferentem…

20,5 The consummation will come when everything spiritual has been formed and perfected by knowledge.[159] This means the spiritual persons who have perfect knowledge of God and are initiates of <the>mysteries of Achamoth;[160] they suppose that <they themselves> are these persons. (6) But soulish people, who are established by works and mere faith and do not have the perfect knowledge,[161] have been taught soulish things. We of the church, they say, are these people.[162] (7) And so they declare that good behavior is essential for us—(we cannot be saved otherwise)[163]—but hold that they will surely be saved in any case, not by (any) behavior but because they are spiritual by nature.[164] (8) For as the earthy can have no part in salvation—they say it is not susceptible of it—so the spiritual, in turn, which they claim to be, does not admit of corruption, in whatever deeds they may take part. (9) For as gold buried in mud does not lose its beauty but retains its own nature, since the mud has no power to harm the gold, they too, they say, in whatever material acts they may engage, cannot be harmed or lose their spirituality.[165]

21,1 Hence, the most perfect of them may do without fear all the forbidden things of which the scriptures affirm that those who do them will not inherit the kingdom of God.[166] (2) They casually eat foods which have been sacrificed to idols, and believe they are in no way defiled by them. They are the first to gather for any holiday celebration of the heathen, held in honor of the idols—and some do not even avoid the murderous spectacle, hateful to God and man, of battles with beasts and gladiatorial combat. (3) Some even serve the pleasures of the flesh to excess and say

---

[159] Cf. the account of the restoration which is given at Tri. Trac. 123,12-124,3.

[160] Cf. Tri. Trac. 118,37-119,7.

[161] Cf. Tri. Trac. 118,27-37; 124,34-131,13.

[162] Cf. Tri. Trac. 122,13-123,3.

[163] Perhaps cf. Tri. Trac. 130,2-27.

[164] Cf. the Valentinian Tri. Trac. 119,16-18. What might be called "salvation by nature" is documented in other types of Gnosticism. See, e.g., Gos. Jud. 43,15-44,4: The souls of every human generation will die. When these people, however, have completed the time of the kingdom and the spirit leaves them their bodies will die, but there souls will be alive and they will be taken up…It is impossible to sow seed on [rock] and harvest its fruit. This also is the way of the [defiled] raced and corruptible Sophia…and cf. Gos. Jud. 37,2-8; 453,16-25; Apoc. Pet. 75,12-76,17 and, less obviously, Gr. Seth 52,10-25; Test. Tr. 67,9-68,11. In Pistis Sophia, souls which have received the higher mysteries are certain of salvation, though with certain qualifications: PS 3.112 (MacDermot pp. 286-291); 3.119 (MacDermot pp. 306-6, 308 et al). None of these sources, however, exempt Gnostics from moral requirements.

[165] See 1 Apoc. Jas. 28,15-20: You have walked in mud, and your garments were not soiled, etc. cf. Cod. Tch. Book of James 15,5-7. The principle is illustrated from a pearl at Gos. Phil. 62,17-26.

[166] Gal. 5:21

they are rendering carnal things to the carnal and spiritual things to the spiritual. (4) And some secretly seduce the women to whom they teach this doctrine, as women have often confessed together with the rest of the imposture, after being deceived by some of them and then returning to God's church. (5) Some, even open in their shamelessness, have enticed any women whom they want away from their husbands, and regarded them as their own wives. (6) Others again, pretending at first to live modestly with them as with sisters, have been exposed in time after the sister has become pregnant by the brother.

21,7 But though they do many other detestable, ungodly things, they cast off on us, who from fear of God guard against sin even in thought and speech,as boors with no understanding. But they exalt themselves above us and call themselves "perfect" and "seed of election." (8) For they say that we receive grace on loan,[167] and so will be deprived of it. But they, as their rightful possession, have the grace come down from above, from the ineffable, unutterable syzygy, and therefore it will be added to them. And thus it is absolutely necessary that they attend at all times to the mystery of the syzygy.

21,9 And they convince the stupid of this by saying in so many words, "Whoever has come into the world and not loved a woman so as to possess her, is not of the truth, and will not depart to the truth. But he who is of the world and has possessed a woman will not depart to the truth because he has possessed a woman in lust."

21,10 And so we, whom they call "soulish" and say are "of the world,"are in need of continence and good behavior so that we may enter the Intermediate Region.[168] But not they, the ones called "spiritual" and "perfect." No deed brings one into the Pleroma, but the seed which is sent from there in its infancy, <and> matures here.

21,11[169] But when all the seed matures, their Mother Achamoth, they say, leaves the Intermediate Region, enters the Pleroma, and receives as her bridegroom Savior, the product of all the Aeons forming a syzygy of Savior and Sophia-Achamoth. And this is the meaning of "bridegroom and bride," and "marriage chamber"[170] means the entire Pleroma. (12) The

---

[167] Cf. "The names which they received on loan" Tri. Trac. 134,20. At Gos. Judas 53,18-22 non-Gnostics are given "spirits…as a loan."

[168] "The soul" seeks the "place of righteousness" which is "mixed" at PS 3.111 (MacDermot p. 282).

[169] With 21,11-12 cf. Val. Exp. 39,28-35.

[170] Cf. Gr. Seth 57,7-18. At Tri. Trac. 121,15 the elect are the bridal chamber. And see n. 4 p. 232.

spiritual will doff their souls, become intellectual spirits, enter the Pleroma[171] untouched and unseen,[172] and be given as brides to Savior's angels.[173] (13) The Demiurge will move too, to Mother Sophia's place,[174] that is, in the Intermediate Region. And the souls of the righteous will also rest in the Intermediate Region—for nothing soulish can enter the Pleroma. (14) But they teach that after that the fire which is latent in the world will flash forth, catch, consume all matter,[175] be consumed with it,[176] and pass into nothingness. They declare that the Demiurge knew none of this before the Savior's advent.

22,1 But there are those who say that he emitted a Christ too[177]—his own son and <himself> soulish—<and> has spoken of him through the prophets. This is the one who passed through Mary as water goes through a pipe, and to him, at the baptism,[178] that Savior from the Pleroma, the product of all, descended in the form of a dove. The spiritual seed from Achamoth came into him as well. (2) Thus they maintain that our Lord was compounded of these four, preserving the type of the original, first tetrad: the spiritual, which was from Achamoth; the soulish, which was from the Demiurge; the dispensation, which was prepared with ineffable art; and Savior, who was <the> dove that came down to him. (3) And Savior remained impassible; it was not possible that he suffer, since he could not be touched or seen. And so, when Jesus was brought before Pilate, the spirit of Christ that had been implanted in him was taken away.

But the seed from the Mother has not suffered either, they say; it too is impassible, <since it is> spiritual, and invisible even to the Demiurge. (4) In sum, their "soulish Christ" suffered, and the one who was mysteriously prepared by the dispensation so that the Mother could exhibit the type of the higher Christ <through> him—the Christ who was stretched out by Cross and gave Achamoth her essential form. For they say that all these things are types of those others.

22,5 They say that the souls which have Achamoth's seed are better than the rest. Thus they are more loved than the others by the Demiurge,

---

[171] Cf. Tri. Trac. 123,22-23; On Res. 44,13-33.
[172] Cf. Acts of Thomas 148 (H-S II p. 398).
[173] Cf. the account of the soul's final ascent at Corp. Herm. 1.26.
[174] See n. 38 p. 174.
[175] Cf. The final conflagration as it is pictured at Gr. Pow. 45,24-47,7. In the Manichaean Homilies see 39,23-24; 41,5.
[176] The final fire consumes itself at Gr. Pow. 30,15-23; 46,29-32.
[177] Sabaoth creates a Christ at 105,20-29.
[178] See n. 4 p. 119.

though he does not know the reason, and thinks that he is responsible for their quality. (6) And so, they say, he appointed them prophets, priests and kings. And they interpret many passages as having been spoken through the prophets by this seed, since it is of a higher nature. They say that the Mother too has said a great deal about the higher things; however, they <claim> that <many things have been said> both through the Demiurge and through the souls he has created. (7) And to conclude, they cut the prophecies to pieces by holding that this one was uttered by the Mother, that one by the seed and the other one by the Demiurge.[179] (8) Jesus, moreover, has likewise said one thing by Savior's inspiration, another by the Mother's, another by the inspiration of the Demiurge, as I shall show in due course.

22,9 But the Demiurge, not knowing what was above him, was angry at those sayings, despised them and thought that they had various causes: either the prophetic spirit, from some motion of its own; or the man; or the admixture of inferior things. (10) And he remained in this ignorance till the Savior's coming. But when the Savior came, they say, he learned everything from him, and gladly came over to him with his entire host.[180] (11) And he is the centurion of the Gospel, who tells the Savior, "For I also have under my authority soldiers and servants, and whatsoever I command, they do."[181] (12) He will fulfil his function in the world as long as necessary, especially because of his concern for the church and is awareness of the reward in store for him—that he will go to the Mother's place.

23,1 They suppose that there are three kinds of men, spiritual, earthy and soulish, just as there were Cain, Abel and Seth—<to illustrate> the three natures even from these, here not as individuals but as types. (2) The earthy kind departs to corruption. The soulish, if it chooses the better part, rests in the Intermediate Region; if it chooses the worse, it too will depart to the like place.[182] (3) But they hold that when the spiritual (seeds) which Achamoth sows among them—having been trained and nurtured here in righteous souls from then till now, since they are sent as infants—will afterwards be awarded as brides to Savior's angels, once they are deemed

---

[179] See p. 67 n. 36 and contrast Hipp. Refut. 6.35.1, where it is said that all of the Law and the Prophets are from the Demiurge.

[180] At Hipp. Refut. 6.35.1 he learns from Sophia.

[181] Matt. 8:9; Luke 7:8. With the enlightenment of the Demiurge here cf. Nat. Arc. 95,13-25; SJC 120,14-121,3; Para. Shem 22,17-23,8. See also PS 2.86 (MacDermot p. 197) "the archons which have repented"; *Ginza* 88,21-34; 356,31-38; 360,21-370,19.

[182] Cf. Hipp. Refut. 6.31.9 and, in a sense, Corp. Herm.1.19.

mature.[183] But of necessity their souls will have gone to eternal rest in the Intermediate Region with the Demiurge. (4) And in turn they subdivide the souls themselves, and say that some are good by nature, others evil by nature. And it is the good souls that become fit to receive the seed; the souls which are evil by nature would never welcome that seed.[184]

24,1 Since such is their thesis—which the prophets did not proclaim, nor the Lord teach, nor the apostles transmit, (yet) which they take extreme pride in knowing better than the others—they read from uncanonical writings, busily plait what they say into ropes of sand and, not to let their forgery appear unevidenced, (2) try to adapt parables of the Lord, oracles of the prophets, or words of the apostles convincingly to what they have said. They violate the arrangement and sequence of the scriptures, and as far as they are able, dismember the truth. (3) They alter and remodel and, by making one thing out of another, completely fool many with their poorly assembled show of the accommodated oracles of the Lord.

24,4 It is as though a beautiful portrait of a king had been carefully made of fine gems by a wise craftsman, and someone were to destroy the image as it stood, reset those gems and recombine them, and produce a likeness of a dog or fox, and poorly made at that—(5) and then state categorically that this was the beautiful portrait of the king which the wise craftsman had made and, by displaying the gems the former craftsman had fitted becomingly into the king's portrait but the latter had reset badly as a likeness of a dog, defraud with the show of the gems the less experienced who had no idea of the king's appearance, and convince them that this latter poor effigy of the fox was the former beautiful portrait of the king. (6) In precisely the same way these people have cobbled old wives' tales together, and then they extract words, sayings and parables from here and there, and want to adapt the oracles of God to their yarns.

25,1 We have spoken of such things as they match with what is inside their Pleroma. Here are the sorts of thing they try to adapt from scripture to the things outside. (2) They say the Lord has come to the passion in the last days of the world to show the passion that overtook the last of the Aeons,[185] and with this "end"[186] to indicate the end of the affair of the Aeons. (3) They explain the twelve-year-old girl, the ruler of the synagogue's daughter, whom the Lord came and raised from the dead, as a type of

[183] Cf. Dia. Sav. 138,16-20.
[184] Different sorts of souls are distinguished at Tri. Trac. 105,29-106,5.
[185] κόσμος = αἴων
[186] τέλος

Achamoth, to whom their Christ gave form when he was extended, and whom he brought to an awareness of the light that had left her.

25,4 They say it was because Savior manifested <himself> to Achamoth when she was outside the Pleroma like an untimely birth[187] that Paul, in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, has said, "Last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time."[188] (5) In the same epistle he has similarly revealed the coming of Savior to Achamoth with his companions by saying, "The woman ought to have a veil on her head because of the angels."[189] And that Achamoth veiled <her face> in shame when Savior came to her, Moses has made evident by covering his face with a veil.

25,6 And they claim the Lord has indicated the passions she suffered <when she was abandoned by the light>. With his words on the cross, "My God, why hast thou forsaken me?"[190] he has shown that Sophia was abandoned by the light and prevented by Limit from starting forward. With, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful,"[191] he has shown her grief; with, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me,"[192] her fear. Similarly her bewilderment, with, "and what I should say, I know not."[193]

25,7 They teach that he has shown that there are three kinds of men in the following ways. The material kind by replying, "The Son of Man hath not where to lay his head," to the man who said, "I will follow thee."[194] The soulish, by answering the man who said, "Lord, I will follow thee, but let me first bid farewell to them which dwell in my house," with, "No man having put his hand to the plow and looking back is suitable in the kingdom of heaven."[195] (8) (This man was one of the intermediate kind, they say.) They claim that the man who professed to have performed the greater part of righteousness, and then would not follow but was vanquished by wealth so that he could not become perfect,[196] was similarly soulish. (9) But he showed the spiritual kind, by saying "Let the dead bury their own dead; but go thou and preach the kingdom of God";[197] and by saying of Zacchaeus

---

187 Cf. Nat. Arc. 94,14-15; Or. Wld. 99,9-11; 23-26.
188 1 Cor. 15 8
189 1 Cor. 11:10
190 Matt. 27:46; Mark 15:34
191 Matt. 26:38
192 Matt. 26:39
193 John 12:27
194 Matt. 8:19-20; Luke 9:57-58
195 Luke 9:61-62
196 Cf. Matt. 19:16-22.
197 Matt. 8:22; Luke 9:60

the publican, "Make haste and come down, for today I must abide at thy house."[198] For they assert that these were of the spiritual kind.

25,10 And they say that the parable of the leaven the woman is said to have hidden in three measures of meal[199] shows the three kinds. For they teach that Sophia is called a woman, but that "three measures of meal" are the three sorts of men, spiritual, soulish, earthy. And they teach that "leaven" means the Savior himself.

25,11 Paul too has spoken expressly of earthy, soulish, and spiritual men—where he says, "As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy";[200] where he says, "The soulish man receiveth not the things of the spirit";[201] and where he says, "A spiritual man examineth all things."[202] And they say that "The soulish man receiveth not the things of the Spirit,"[203] refers to the Demiurge who, being soulish, did not know the Mother who is spiritual, or her seed or the Aeons in the Pleroma.

25,12 Because the Savior received the firstfruits of those he was to save, Paul has said, "If the firstfruits be holy, the lump is also holy."[204] They teach that "firstfruits" means the spiritual[205] but "lump" means ourselves, the soulish church, whose lump they say he received and raised in himself, since he himself was leaven.

26,1 And by saying that he had come for the <sheep> that was lost,[206] they say he made it known that Achamoth strayed outside the Pleroma, and was formed by Christ and sought out by Savior. (2) For they explain that "lost sheep" means their Mother, by whom they hold that the church here has been sown. But "straying" means the time she spent outside the Pleroma, in <all> the passions from which they suppose that matter originated.

26,3 They explain that the woman who swept the house and found the drachma[207] means the Sophia on high, who had lost her Resolve but found her later when all had been purified by Savior's arrival. Therefore, as they believe, she herself was restored to her place within the Pleroma.

---

198 Luke 19:5
199 Cf. Matt. 13:33.
200 1 Cor. 15:48
201 1 Cor. 2:14
202 1 Cor. 2:15
203 1 Cor. 2:14
204 Rom. 11:16
205 Cod. Tch. James 28,14-16: I receive the firstfruits of those who are defiled, so that I may send them up undefiled.
206 Cf. Matt. 18:2; Luke 15:4.
207 Cf. Apocry. Jn. 8,9-10.

26,4 They say that Simeon, who took Christ in his arms, thanked God and said, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace according to thy word,"[208] is a type of the Demiurge. When the Savior came he learned of his translation and gave thanks to Depth.

26,5 And they declare that Achamoth is very plainly made known through Anna, whom the Gospel proclaims a prophetess, and who had lived seven years with a husband and always remained a widow after that, till she saw and recognized the Savior and spoke of him to everyone.[209] Achamoth saw Savior briefly <then> with his companions, and always remained in the Intermediate Region afterwards, awaiting the time when he would return and restore her to her syzygy. (6) And her name has been made known by the Savior in saying, "And Sophia is justified by her children,"[210] and by Paul with, "Howbeit we speak of 'Sophia' among them that are perfect." '[211]

26,7 And they claim that in one instance Paul has spoken specifically of the syzygies within the Pleroma. For of the syzygy which relates to the world he wrote, "This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and Church."[212]

27,1 They teach further that John, the disciple of the Lord, has revealed the former Ogdoad. Their exact words are, (2) "John, the disciple of the Lord, desiring to speak of the generation of all by which the Father emitted all things, posits as the first to be generated by God a 'Beginning,' which he has called both 'Son' and 'Only-Begotten God.' In this, in germ, the Father emitted all. (3) And he says that 'Word' has been emitted by him, and in Word the entire essence of the Aeons, to which Word himself later imparted form. Since John is speaking of a first act of generation, he rightly begins his teaching with the 'Beginning,' that is, the Son and the Word.

27,4 "For he says as follows: 'In Beginning was Word, and Word was with God, and Word was God. The same was in Beginning with God."[213] (5) After first distinguishing the three—God, Beginning and Word—he combines again, to show the emission of the two, Son and Word, and their union with each other as well as with the Father. (6) For Beginning is in the Father and of the Father, and Word is in Beginning and of Beginning. He was right, then, in saying, 'In Beginning was Word,' for Word was in Son.

---

[208] Luke 2:29
[209] Cf. Luke 2:36-38.
[210] Luke 7:35
[211] 1 Cor. 2:6
[212] Eph. 5:32
[213] John 1:1-2

And in saying, 'And Word was with God', for Beginning <was> indeed <with the Father>. And accordingly, 'Word was God' for what is begotten of God is God. <And by>, 'The same was in Beginning with God,' he indicated their order of emission.

27,7 "'All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made'"[214] for Word became the cause of the form and the generation for all the Aeons after him. But with 'That which was made in him is Life'[215] he even made reference at this point to a syzygy. He said that all things have been brought into being through Word, but Life in Word. (8)"Thus she who came to be in him is more closely related to him than those who came to be through him, for she is his consort and bears fruit through him. (9) For since adds, 'And Life was the light of men,'[216] by saying 'Man' now he has also made Church known under the same name, to show the partnership of the syzygy through the one name; for Man and Church arise from Word and Life. (10) And he termed Life the 'light of men,' since men are enlightened—that is, formed and made manifest—by her. And Paul says this too, 'Whatsoever is made manifest is light.'[217] Therefore, since Life made Man and Church manifest and brought them into being, she is called their light.

27,11 "With these words, then, John has clearly indicated both the others and the second tetrad: Word and Life, Man and Church. (12) But he has certainly made the first tetrad known as well. For in discussing the Savior and stating that everything outside the Pleroma has been formed by him, he calls him the fruit of the entire Pleroma. (13) For he has called him the 'light' that shines in darkness and was not comprehended by it, because though the Savior bestowed order on all that had resulted from the passion he was not known by them. (14) And John calls him both 'Son' and 'Truth,' and 'Light' and 'Word made flesh, whose glory,' he says, 'we beheld; and his glory was as that of an Only-Begotten, given him of the Father, full of Grace and Truth.'[218] (15) And he says it as follows, 'And Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of an Only-Begotten of a Father, full of Grace and Truth.'[219] He made the first tetrad specifically known, then, by saying Father, Grace, Only-Begotten,

[214] John 1:3
[215] John 1:4
[216] John 1:4
[217] Eph. 5:13
[218] John 1:14
[219] John 1:14

and Truth. (16) In this way John has spoken of the first Ogdoad, mother of all the Aeons. For he has said Father, Grace, Only-Begotten, Truth, and Word, Life, Man, and Church."

28,1 You see their method of deceiving themselves, beloved, their abuse of the scriptures to try to prove their fabrication from them. This is the reason I have cited even their actual words, so that from them you may realize the villainy of the craft and the wickedness of the imposture. (2) In the first place, if John intended to reveal the higher Ogdoad, he would have kept to the order of the emanation, and placed the first Tetrad, which they say is the most venerable, among the names that come first. He would then have added the second to show the order of the Ogdoad by the order of the names and not mentioned the first Tetrad after such a long interval, as though he had completely forgotten it and then recalled it at the last minute.

28,3 And then, if he meant to indicate the sygyzies, he would not have left Church's name out. He might have been equally content to name the males in the case of the other syzygies—they too can be understood to go with (their females)—to maintain uniformity throughout. <Or>, if he were listing the consorts of the rest, he would have revealed Man's too, and not left us to get her name by divination.

28,4 <Their> distortion of the exegesis is obvious. Where John proclaims one God almighty, and one Only-begotten, Christ Jesus, through whom he says all things were made, <saying> that he is Son of God, he is only-begotten, he is maker of all, he is the true light that enlightens every man, is creator of the world, is the one who came unto his own, and that he himself became flesh and dwelt among us—(5) these people, speciously perverting the exegesis, hold that there is another Only-Begotten in the series of emanations whom they also call Beginning, and that there was another Savior and another Word, the son of Only-begotten, and another Christ, emitted for the.rectification of the Pleroma (6) They have taken its every statement away from the truth <and> adapted it to their own doctrine by misusing the names so that, to hear them tell it, among so many names John makes no mention of the Lord, Christ Jesus. (7) For though he has said Father, Grace, Only-begotten, Truth, Word, Life, Man, and Church, on their hypothesis he has said it of the first Ogdoad, in which there is no Jesus yet and no Christ, the teacher of John.

28,8 But the apostle himself has made it plain that he has not spoken of their syzygies but of our Lord Jesus Christ, whom he also knows as the Word of God. (9) For in his recapitulation concerning the Word whom he

has already said to have been "in the beginning," he adds the explanation, "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us." But on their hypothesis the Word, who never even left the Pleroma, did not become flesh. That was Savior, who was the product of all the Aeons, and of later origin than Word.

29,1 You fools, learn that Jesus himself, who suffered for us, who made his dwelling among us, is the Word of God! If some other Aeon had become flesh for our salvation, the apostle would presumably have spoken of another. But if the Word of the Father, who descended, is <also> the one who ascended—the only-begotten Son of the only God, made flesh for man at the Father's good pleasure—then <John> has not written "Word" of any other, or of an Ogdoad, but of the Lord Jesus Christ.

29,2 Nor, in their view, has the Word become principally flesh. They say that Savior put on a soulish body which had been prepared, by an ineffable providence of the dispensation, to become visible and tangible. (3) But flesh is God's ancient formation from the dust, like Adam, which, John has made clear, God's Word has truly become.

29,4 And their first, original Ogdoad has been demolished. Once it is established that Word, Only-Begotten, Life, Light, Savior and Christ are one and the same and God's Son, and that he himself was made flesh for us, the flimsy structure[220] of <their> Ogdoad is destroyed. And with this wrecked their whole pantomine—which they falsely dream up to disparage the scriptures after fabricating their own hypothesis—has collpased.

29,5 Then they gather expressions and names which lie scattered throughout scripture, move them away, as I said, from their natural setting to an unnatural one, and do the same sort of thing as the persons who set themselves subjects at random and then try to declaim them in lines from Homer, (6) making it seem to the simple that Homer has composed the words on that subject which has been declaimed extemporaneously; and by the artificial sequence of the words, many are rushed into supposing that Homer might have written these things in this way. (7) So with the person who wrote the following in lines from Homer, about the sending of Heracles being by Eurystheus for the dog in Hades. (There is nothing to prevent me from mentioning even these by way of illustration, since <the> enterprise of both parties is one and the same.)

---

[220] σκηνοπηγία. σκήνη is a flimsy, temporary dwelling.

(8) So spake Eurystheus, son of Sthenelus
Persëides, and sent upon his way
Hard-laboring Heracles, to fetch from Hell
The loathèd Hades' dog. With heavy sighs
He hastened through the town, like to a lion
Bred in the mountains, trusting in its strength.
All they that loved him bare him company,
Young maids, and elders worn with toil and care,
Mourning for him as on his way to death
But lo, gray-eyed Athena, in her heart—
For hers was kin to his—knowing his toil,
Sent Hermes to his aid.

29,9 What innocent person could fail to be swept off his feet by these words, and suppose that Homer had written them in this way, on this subject? But anyone familiar with the works of Homer will recognize <the words but not their subject>, (10) since he knows that some are spoken of Odysseus, some actually of Heracles, but some of Priam and some of Menelaus and Agamemnon. He will take the lines, restore each one to its own <book>, and get rid of the subject <we see here>. (11) So one who holds upright within him the rule of the truth which he has received through baptism will recognize the names, expressions and parables from the scriptures, but not recognize this blasphemous subject. (12) For though he will certify the gems, he will not allow the fox in place of the king's portrait. By restoring each thing that has been said to its own position and fitting it to the naked body of the truth, he will prove their forgery without foundation.

30,1 <But>, since this jerry built structure is beyond redemption, I think it will be well, so that anyone who has perused their farce may apply the argument which demolishes it, to show first how the authors of this story themselves differ from each other, as though inspired by different spirits of error. (2) In this way too we may understand perfectly—even before it is demonstrated—that the truth the church proclaims is sure, and the one they have counterfeited is falsehood.

30,3 For the church, though it is dispersed the whole world over to the ends of the earth, has received from the apostles and their disciples, the faith in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven, earth, the seas, and everything in them. (4) And in one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who was made flesh for our salvation. (5) And in the Holy Spirit, who through the prophets has proclaimed the dispensations, the advent, the birth from

the Virgin, passion, resurrection and bodily assumption into heaven of the beloved <Son>, Christ Jesus our Lord, and his coming from heaven in his Father's glory to gather all things in one and raise the flesh of all mankind; (6) that, by the invisible Father's good pleasure, every knee in heaven, on earth, and under the earth may bow to Christ Jesus, our Lord, God, Savior and King, and every tongue confess him. And that he may pronounce a righteous judgment on all, (7) and consign the spirits of wickedness, the angels who have transgressed and rebelled, and wicked, unrighteous, lawless and blasphemous men, to the eternal fire; (8) but grant life, bestow immortality, and secure eternal glory for the righteous and holy, who have kept his commandments and abode in his love, some from the first, others after repentance.

31,1 Having, as we have said, received this message and this faith the church, though dispersed over all the world, guards them as carefully as though it lived in one house, believes them as with one soul and the same heart, and preaches, teaches and transmits them in unison, as with one mouth. (2) For even if the languages of the world are different, the meaning of the tradition is one and the same. The churches founded in Germany have not believed differently or transmitted the tradition differently—or the ones founded among the Iberians, the Celts, in the east, in Libya, or in the center of the earth. (3) As the sun, a creature of God, is one and the same the world over, so the light <of the mind>, the proclamation of the truth, shines everywhere and illumines all who are willing to come to a knowledge of truth. (4) The ablest speaker of the church's leaders will say nothing different from these things, for no man is above his master[221] nor will the feeble speaker diminish the tradition. For as faith is one and the same, he who has much to say of it cannot enlarge it, and he who has little to say has not diminished it.

31,5 For one to know more or less with understanding means, not changing the actual subject (of our knowledge) and—as though as though not satisfied with him—inventing a new God other than the creator, maker and sustainer of all, or another Christ or Only-Begotten. (6) It means giving further explanation of what has been said in parables, and suiting it to the subject of the faith. It means expounding God's dealings with mankind and his provision for them, and making it plain that God bore with the rebellion of the angels who transgressed, and the disobedience of men. (7) It

[221] Cf. Matt. 10:24.

means proclaiming the reason why one and the same God has made things temporal and eternal, heavenly and earthly, and why, though invisible, God appeared to the prophets, not in one form but present differently to different ones. It means making the reason known why men have been given a number of covenants, and teaching the nature of each; (8) searching out the reason why God confined all in disobedience so as to have mercy upon all; giving thanks for the reason why God's Word became flesh and suffered, and proclaiming the reason why the advent of God's Son appeared in the last times, which is to say that the beginning appeared in the end.

31,9 It means unfolding what scripture says of the end and the things to come; not leaving unsaid the reason why God has made the reprobate gentiles fellow-heirs, of the same body and partakers with the saints; (10) proclaiming how this mortal flesh will put on immortality, this corruptible, incorruption; declaring how God will say, "That which was not my people is my people, and she who was not beloved, is beloved,"[222] and "More are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife."[223]

31,11 For it was at these things and their like that the apostle cried, "O the depth of the riches both of the Sophia and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!"[224] It was not at inventing his Mother up above the Creator and Demiurge, and the Resolve of their erring Aeon, and going on to such a degree of blasphemy. (12) Nor was it <at> teaching still more lies about the Pleroma above her in turn—of thirty Aeons then, <innumerable tribes of them now>—as these teachers say who are truly barren of divine understanding—while all the true church, as we have said, holds one and the same faith the world over.

32,1 Now let us also see their unstable views—how, when there are perhaps two or three of them, they cannot say the same about the same things, but make assertions which contradict each other in thing and name. (2) For Valentinus, the first of the so-called Gnostic sect to adapt its principles to a form characteristic of a school, blurted them out like this, with the declaration that there is <an> unnameable pair, one of which is called Ineffable, and the other Silence. (3) Then a second pair has been emitted from this, one of which he names Father and the other, Truth. Word and Life, and Man and Church, are the fruit of this Tetrad; and this is the first Ogdoad. (4) And he says that ten powers have been emitted from Word and

[222] Hos. 2:25; Rom. 9:25
[223] Isa. 54:1
[224] Rom. 11:33

Life, as we mentioned, and from Man and Church, twelve—one of whom, by rebelling and coming to grief, has caused the rest of the affair.

32,5 And he supposed that there were two Limits, one between Depth and the rest of the Pleroma separating the generate Aeons from the ingenerate Father;[225] the other one separating their Mother from the Pleroma. (6) And Christ has not been emitted from the Aeons in the Pleroma, but together with a certain shadow[226] was produced in memory of better things by the Mother, when she found herself outside. (7) Christ, being male, cut the shadow off and returned to the Pleroma but the Mother, abandoned with the shadow and emptied of spiritual essence, bore another son. And this is the Demiurge, whom he also says is Pantocrator of all who are below him. But like the persons falsely termed Gnostics of whom we shall speak, Valentinus held that a lefthand archon has also been emitted with the Demiurge.

32,8 And he sometimes says that Jesus was emitted by the one whom their Mother inhaled <and> mixed with all things—that is, <by> Desired—but sometimes by the one who returned to the Pleroma, that is, Christ—or sometimes, by Man and Church. (9) And he says that the Holy Spirit was emitted by Truth to examine the Aeons and make them fruitful by entering them invisibly. Through him the Aeons bring forth the fruits of the truth.

This concludes Irenaeus against the Valentinans

33,1 <By giving> both these <explanations> and others like them the elder of whom we have spoken, Irenaeus—fully equipped by the Holy Spirit, sent into the ring by <the> Lord as a champion athlete, and anointed with the heavenly favors of the true faith and knowledge—went over every bit of their nonsense as he wrestled their whole silly story to the ground and defeated it. (2) And he demolished them further, superbly, in his next book, the second, and the others. He seemed to want to drag his opponent after he had already been thrown and beaten, to make a public spectacle of him, and to detect the shameless though feeble challenge of his weak-mindedness that was in him even when he was down. (3) I, however, am content with the few things I have said and the things these writers of the truth have said and compiled, and can see that others have done the work—I mean Clement, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and many more, who have

[225] Cf. Val. Exp. 27,29-38.
[226] For "shadow" in a comparable sense see Or. Wld. 97,29-98,7; 98,23-99,2.

given the Valentinians' refutation even remarkably well. Being content with these men and in full agreement with them I have no desire at all, as I said, to add to my labor, since from the very contents of the Valentinians' teachings the refutation of them will be <perfectly plain> to any person of understanding.

34,1 In the first place their own ideas vary, and each one sets out to demolish the other's. Secondly, their myths are unprovable since no scripture has said these things—neither the Law of Moses nor any prophet after Moses, neither the Savior nor his evangelists, and certainly not the apostles. (2) If these things were true, the Lord who came to enlighten the world, and the prophets before him, would have told us things of this sort in plain language—and then the apostles too, who confuted idolatry and all sorts of wrongdoing, and were not afraid to write against any unlawful teaching, and opposition. (3) Especially when the Savior himself says, "Unto them that are without, in parables; but to you <the explanation of the parables (is given), for knowledge of the kingdom of heaven.>"[227] (4) Plainly, he explained at once any of his parables in the Gospels. Of course he says who the mustard seed is, who the leaven is, the woman who put the leaven in the three measures, the vineyard, the fig tree, the sower, the best soil.

34,5 Also, these people too are vainly inspired because they are in the power of demons. The most holy apostle Paul says of them, "In the latter times some shall depart from the teaching, giving heed to fables and doctrines of devils."[228] (6) And again, St. James says of this sort of teaching, "This Sophia descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish. But the Sophia that is from above is first of all pure, then peaceable, easy to be intreated, without partiality, full of mercy and good fruits,"[229] and so on. Not one fruit of this Sophia is to be found in these people. (7) With them there is "confusion and every unlawful work,"[230] spawn of devils and serpents' hisses, with each one saying something different at a different time. No mercy or pity is to be found in them, only hair-splittings and disagreements; nowhere purity, nowhere peace, nowhere fairness.

35,1 But again, since the argument demands it, I do want to mention a few of the things they say and refute them, even though I promised to finish. I do not care for the art of rhetoric but for my readers' benefit. (2) Now

---

[227] Cf. Mark 4:11
[228] 1 Tim. 4:1
[229] Jas. 3:15; 17
[230] Jas 3:10

then, they say that the twelfth Aeon, the one which became defective, dropped out of the twelve entirely, and the number twelve was lost. (3) But they say that this was caused by the defection of Judas, the twelfth apostle, with the consequent disappearance of the number twelve. And similarly of the woman with the issue, and the one who lost the one drachma out of her ten. (4) However it is established that, as the most holy Irenaeus has already said, the twelfth Aeon can neither be represented by Judas[231]—for Judas has perished utterly, but the so-called twelfth Aeon of their fabrication was not emptied; Conductor, or Limit-Setter, stood in front of it and said "Iao" to it, as they say themselves, and this made it firm. (5) Nor can the woman who bled for twelve years be compared with their stage piece. She was healed after the twelve years in which she was afflicted with bleeding. She did not remain unafflicted for eleven years and bleed in the twelfth; instead she bled during the eleven, but was healed in the twelfth.[232] (6) Nor did the woman who had the ten drachmas lose the one for good, allowing for their story of the lost Aeon of matter; she lit her lamp and found the drachma.

36,1 Since all their assertions, then, have been summarily refuted by these two or three arguments, they will be understood by the prudent children of God's holy catholic church as feeble, worthless melodrama. (2) For not to drag my treatise out endlessly by attacking the same people, I shall end my exposition here, set a bound to their wickedness great as it is, and go on to the rest. (3) I call on God to be the guide and help of my weakness, that I may be preserved from this sect and the ones I have mentioned before it—and the ones I plan to exhibit to the studious, who want a precise knowledge of all the foolish assertions there are in the world, and the chains which cannot hold.

36,4 For by sowing his dreaming in many people and calling himself a Gnostic, Valentinus has, as it were, fastened a number of scorpions together in one chain, as in the old and well-known parable. It says that scorpions, one after another, will form a sort of chain to a length of ten or even more, let themselves down from a roof or housetop, and so do their harm to men by guile. (5) Thus both he, and the so-called Gnostics who derive from him, have become authors of imposture and each, taking his cue from him, has been instructed by someone else, added to the imposture after his teacher, and introduced another sect clinging to the one before it. (6) And thus the so-called Gnostics have been divided successively into

[231] Iren. 2.20.2-5
[232] Iren. 2.23.1

different sects themselves; but, as I said, they have taken their cue from Valentinus and his predecessors. (7) Still, since we have trampled on them and on this sect of Valentinus with the teaching of the truth, let us pass them by, but by God's power examine the rest.

32.
Against Secundians[1] *with whom Epiphanes and Isidore are associated. Number twelve, but thirty-two of the series*

1,1 Now that I have passed Valentinus' sect by, worked hard in his sowing of thistles, and <gone through it>, I may say, with a great deal of trouble and hard field labor, I shall go to the remains of his sowing of thistles and snake's carcass, (2) praying to the Lord for the Holy Spirit, that through him I may be able to shield souls from harm by godly teaching and grave speech, and suck the poisons out of those who already have this infection. (3) But of each of the following I shall begin to say, one after another, which teacher was the successor of which of the teachers who were derived from Valentinus and yet teach a sowing other than his.

1,4 Now Secundus, who was one of them and wanted to think of something further, expounded everything in Valentinus' way, but made a louder racket in the ears of the crack-brained. (5) Being like Valentinus as I said, but more conceited than Valentinus, he said that the first Ogdoad is a righthand tetrad and a lefthand tetrad, and therefore taught that the one is called "light," and the other, "darkness." (6) And the power that fell away and came to grief was not one of the thirty aeons, but came after the thirty aeons and was thus one of <their fruits, which> originated lower down, after the other Ogdoad.[2] (7) But as to Christ and the other doctrines he held precisely the same position as Valentinus, his own provider of venom and dispenser of poison.

1,8 Since he does not have many strange doctrines that are distinctive I feel I should rest content with the ones I have mentioned, which are refutable even of themselves. Still, I am going to say a few things about

---

[1] The material concerning Secundus himself, and Epiphanes, is drawn from Iren. 1.11.2-5; at 6,7 Epiph cites Irenaeus by name. To the Irenaean material Epiph adds Clement of Alexandria's comments on Epiphanes and others, quoting verbatim from Strom. 3.2.5.1-2.

The very summary accounts of Secundus at Hipp. 6.38.1-2 and PsT 4.7 represent Hipp. Synt. Tert. Adv. Val. 37-38 depends on Irenaeus. Fil. 40 might be based on Irenaeus, Epiph or both.

[2] Cf. Iren. 1.11.2; Hipp. Refut. 6.38.1; PsT 4.7; Tert. Adv. Val. 38.

him too, lest it appear that I have bypassed the discussion of him because of being at a loss.

1,9 If their tetrads are ranged on the right and the left, it will be found that something is required in between the right and the left. (10) Anything with righthand and lefthand sides stands in between its right and left hands, and there can be no right or left unless the distinction is made because of a body which intervenes between either one. (11) Now then, Secundus you fool and the people who are fooled by you, the center, by which both right and left are determined, (12) must be some one thing, and the right and left which are determined by it cannot be alien to this one thing. And the whole must necessarily be traced back to that which is One, with not one thing above it and nothing below it, except the things it has created. (13) And to those who understand the truth it will be plain that God is one, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. But if God, from whom all things come, is one, there is no "left" in him, or any other defect, or anything inferior except the things he has made. And the things after the Father, Son and Holy Spirit have all been made well, and brought ungrudgingly into being, by himself.

2,1 But even though another snake of his kind comes forward and replies to me that the right and the left are outside of the One, while he himself is the middle, and that the righthand things are embraced by him, and he rejoices in them and names them "right" and "light," but he abhors the lefthand things as strange to him and lying on his left—he had better tell me where he gets this geometry that allows him a to make a neat arrangement of an unalterable right and left. (2) For right or left in us is aptly named from the limbs, which are fixed in the body and never interchangeable. (3) But anything outside us can sometimes be "right" and sometimes "left." The south, or meridial, region, will be called "right" by everyone who is facing east, and the northerly, or arctural region, "left." (4) But on the contrary, when one has turned west the directions will be found to have different names. The southerly and meridial direction which was "right" a minute ago, is transformed into "left" in its turn, and the arctural, or northerly, which has been on one's left, is transformed into his right. (5) Very well, where did the fraud find his divinely ordained geometry? What a lot of nonsense there is of this kind, which mixes everything up!

2,6 But he claims that the Deficiency[3] came into being after the thirty Aeons. All right, Mister, tell me, where did you get the origin of the

[3] See p. 170 n. 9.

Deficiency, or the power that fell away! (7) If you found it <grown> from a shoot of the things on high, not a created thing but something generated—created things are not defined as created by you and your master, but the products of successive generations <are supposed> to have grown up, generated and by participation, with each nature receiving from each. (If this is what you mean), on your own terms you are taking up arms against yourself. (8) For if both the later power and the defection have been generated by the things on high, and if it sprouted, let us say, and grew from them, then it partakes of the benefits on high. For the later power communicates with the Pleroma and the Pleroma with the later power, and there can be no difference between the one and the other, or between the other and the one, since they are both in contact at their ends. (9) And on every account, you most wretched of all wretches, you will be caught getting the fodder for your imposture from a devil's second sowing.

3,1 But not to leave out anything that is done and said in any group—even if in each group there are many founders and persons who proudly go beyond their teachers by inventing story after story—I shall go on discussing the ones who are in this sect itself but say something different from the above. (2) I am speaking of Epiphanes[4] the pupil of Isidore, who dragged himself down to a further depth of misery under the cover of hortatory speeches. To tell the truth he took his cue from his own father, Carpocrates; but he was associated with this Secundus' sect, and was a Secundian himself. (3) For there was considerable difference between each of these misguided persons and the other, and a sort of miscellaneous tangle, as we might say, of silly talk.

3,4 This Epiphanes as I said, who was a son of Carpocrates and whose mother's name was Alexandria, is connected with the Secundians. On his father's side he was a Cephallenian. <But> he died early at the age of seventeen[5] as though the Lord, making a better provision for the world, were getting rid of the worthless thorns. (5) After his death, however, those who had gone astray on his account did not get over the plague they had caught from him. (6) At Same he is still honored as a god, even today; the locals have established a sanctuary for him and offer sacrifices and rites every

[4] Epiph construes Iren. 1.11.3 as, "Another one, their teacher Epiphanes, says…" and identifies this teacher with the Epiphanes mentioned by name at Clem. Alex. Strom. 3.2.1. Irenaeus' Greek, probably represented by Hipp. Refut. 6.38.2, reads Ἄλλος δέ τις ἐπιφανὴς διδάσκαλος αὐτῶν, οὕτως λέγει… There may in fact be some justification for his identification of Epiphanes; see n. 17 below.

[5] Clem. Alex. Strom. 3.2.5.2

new moon, and have put up altars to him and founded a well-known library in his name, the so-called Library of Epiphanes. (7) The Cephallenians are so far gone in error that they sacrifice and pour libations to him, and have banquets and sing hymns to him in his sanctuary which they have established.[6] (8) But it was because of the excess of his education, both in the arts and in Platonic philosophy[7] that the whole deceit came to them from him, the error about the sect and about the other error, I mean the one that has turned the Samians to idol mania.

3,9 And so Epiphanes was associated with Secundus and his circle. For he copied Secundus' poison, that is, his wordy babble of baneful, reptilian corruption. (4,1) They claim, however, that Isidore[8] in his exhortations was the one responsible for their wickedness. But I cannot find out for certain whether Isidore himself thought the same as they and was originally one of them, or whether he was another hortatory author who had learned from the philosophers. In any case these people are all in the same line of business.

4,2 In the first place Epiphanes himself, together with Carpocrates, who was his father and the leader of his sect, and the people about Carpocrates, ruled that men's wives are to be held in common, taking his cue for this from Plato's Republic and getting what he wanted himself. (3) But he begins by saying that, as the Savior teaches, there are three kinds of eunuch in the Gospel—the eunuch made by men, the eunuch from birth, and the eunuch who becomes one willingly for the kingdom of heaven's sake.[9] (4)[10] "Therefore," he says, "those who are so of necessity do not become eunuchs by reason. But those who make themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake <make this> choice, they say, because of the consequences of matrimony, for fear of the business <of earning> a living. (5) <And by> "It is better to marry than to burn; do not cast thy soul into fire,"[11] he says that the apostle means, "Hold out and fear night and day lest you fall from continence. For a soul that is bent on resistance has a portion of the hope."

4,6 "'Resist a contentious woman,'[12] then'"—as I have already said, (he is) quoting the exhortation—"'says Isidore in so many words in the

---

[6] Clem. Alex. Strom. 3.2.5.2
[7] Clem. Alex. Strom. 3.2.5.3
[8] Clem. Alex. Strom. 3.1.2.3. The Stromata also mention Isidore at 2.20.113.3 and 6.6.58.2f. In NHC see Test. Tr. 57,6-8.
[9] Matt. 19:12; Clem. Alex. Strom. 3.1.1-2
[10] 4,4-5,3 are quoted directly from Clem. Alex. Strom. 3.1.1.2-3.3.
[11] Cf. 1 Cor. 7:9.
[12] Prov 21:19

Ethics, 'lest you be drawn away from God's grace, and pray with a good conscience once you have ejaculated the fire.[13] But when your thanksgiving descends to petition and for the rest you stand, not upright but on the brink of falling, marry!'"[14]

4,7 Then he says in turn, "'But one who is a youth, or poor, or declining'"—that is, ill—"'and prefers not to marry as reason dictates, let this one not be separated from his brother.'"[15] The wretch is dramatizing and inviting certain shameful suspicions of himself, <for> he says, (8) "'Let him say, Since I have entered the holies I cannot be affected. But if he feels a presentiment let him say, Lay your hand on me, brother, lest I sin; and he will receive aid both intelligible and sensible. Only let him will to achieve the good, and he will attain.'"

4,9 Then again, he says, "'At times we say with our lips, We will not sin, but our minds are bent on sin. Such a man is refraining out of fear from doing the thing he desires, lest he be assessed the penalty. But mankind has certain members which are essential and natural, <and some which are natural> only. Its clothing (with flesh) is natural and essential, but its organ of desire is likewise natural, but <not> essential.'"

5,1 "I have quoted these remarks," the author who wrote against them <says>, "in refutation of those who do not live rightly," and the Basilideans and Carpocratians, and those who are named for Valentinus and Epiphanes, with whom the Secundus whom I placed before him, was associated. (2) For whether the latter passed these horrors on to the fomer or the former to the latter, they bartered for them with each other. And though they differed from each other to some extent they enrolled themselves in the same sect, (3) "and so held that, because of their perfection, they had license even to sin, since they would surely be saved by nature even if they were to sin now—due to their natural election, (I presume), since not even the original authors of these doctrines permit them to do these things."

5,4[16] "As though they were aspiring to something loftier and on a higher plane of knowledge, these too speak of the first tetrad, in this way: "There is a certain principle prior to all of which there can be no preconception, ineffable and unnameable, which I call Unity. With this Unity there coex-

---

[13] Cf. Thom. Cont. 141,25-31; 143,26-30; 144,14; Man. Keph. 26,15-17.

[14] Holl followed Jülicher's suggested reading, καὶ στῇς εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν, μὴ κατορθώσας, σφαλῆναι, γάμησον.

[15] Perhaps cf. GT 25: "Love your brother like your soul, guard him like the pupil of your eye."

[16] 5,4-7,5 are in part quoted and in part summarized from Iren. 1.11.2-5. See also Hipp. Refut. 6.38.2-4; Tert. Adv. Val. 37.

ists a power which I, likewise, term Oneness. (5) This Unity and Oneness, which are the One, though they had not been emitted themselves, emitted a principle intelligible in all respects, ingenerate and invisible, a principle which reason terms Monad. (6) With this Monad there coexists a power of the same nature as itself, which I term the Unit. These powers, Unity and Oneness, Monad and the Unit,[17] emitted the remaining emanations of the Aeons'"[18]

6,1 Next the authors who had written the truth <about> these people so well refuted <them> in their own treatises–Clement, whom some call Clement of Alexandria, and others, Clement of Athens—(2) and St. Irenaeus besides (who), to poke fun at that tragic drama of theirs, quoted those words and raised <the cry of> (3) "Alas and alack!" over them. "<The> tragic outcry may truly be made for a misfortune as great as that of those who have composed these ridiculous specimens of such a coinage as this—and for so much impudence that he has unblushingly given names to his fabrication. (4) For in saying,' There is a prior principle before all, priorly inconceivable, which I call Unity—and again, 'With this Unity there coexists a power which I, likewise, term Oneness'—he has made the plainest sort of admission that what he has said is his own fabrication, and that he himself has given the fabrication names never given by anyone else. (5) And it is plain that he himself has ventured to coin the names, and if he were not alive the truth would not have had a name. (6) Hence there is nothing to prevent someone else from assigning names of this sort for the same purpose."

6,7 Then in conclusion to this the same blessed Irenaeus—as I said—proposes ridiculous terms himself, saying jokingly that a different nomenclature of his own is worth just as much as their silliness. He makes up family trees of melons, cucumbers and gourds as though for real things, <the aptness of which> must be clear to the studious from what they have read.

7,1 "But others of them in turn have called the first, original Ogdoad by these names: First, Prior Principle; next, Inconceivable; but third, Ineffable, and fourth, Invisible. (2) And from the first, Prior Principle, Beginning has been emitted in the first and fifth <place>.[19] From Inconceivable, in the

[17] For these terms see Unger-Dillon.

[18] Clem. Alex. Strom. 3.2.5-3 says of Epiphanes, καθηγήσατο . . . τῆς μοναδικῆς γνώσεως, perhaps linking Epiphanes with the sort of material which is reported at Iren. 1.11.3 and Hipp. 6.38.2.

[19] Cf. ". . . (I) stood upon the first aeon which is the fourth" (Zost. 6,19-20) . . . "I stood upon the second aeon which is the third" (7,6-8) . . . "I stood upon the third aeon which is the second" (7,14-15) . . . "[I stood upon] the fourth aeon which is the first]" (7,20-21).

second and sixth place, Incomprehensible has been emitted; from Ineffable, in the third and seventh place, Unnameable, and from Invisible, Ingenerate. (This is) the Pleroma of the first Ogdoad. (3) They hold that these powers are prior to Depth and Silence, in order to seem more perfect than the perfect and more gnostic than the Gnostics—but one might rightly address these people as, 'You driveling sophists!'

7,4 "Indeed, they have different opinions of Depth himself. Some say he is unattached, neither male nor female, not a thing at all. Others say he is male and female, ascribing hermaphrodism to him. (5) Others again attach Silence to him as bedfellow to form a first syzygy,"[20] and then dramatically produce the rest from him and her. (6) And there is a lot of foolish dreaming in them, lulling their minds into a deep slumber.

7,7 But why spend so much time, since from what has been said the case against them, and their refutation and overthrow, is observable by everyone who wants to keep hold of his life and not be deceived by empty myths. (8) I shall say no more about them. Passing this sect by I shall <go> to the rest to look for a safe way and level path by which to traverse and refute their evils and so bring myself and my hearers to safety by God's power, through the teaching and true contemplation of our Lord. (9) Having trod this viper underfoot with the sandal of the Gospel—like the mousing viper, one which is like many other vipers—let us examine the rest.

33.

Against Ptolemaeans.[1] *Number thirteen, but thirty-three of the series*

1,1 Ptolemy succeeds Secundus, and the man named Epiphanes who got the cue for his own opinion by barter from Isidore. He belongs to the same sect of the so-called Gnostics, and with certain others <is one of> the Valentinians, but he has suppositions which are different from his teachers'. His adherents even pride themselves on his name and are called Ptolemaeans.

1,2[2] This "Ptolemy, with his adherents, has come before us as someone still more expert" than his own teachers and one who invents lots and lots

[20] Iren. 1.11.5. Cf. Hipp. 6.38.3-5.

[1] Sect 33 is drawn from Iren. 1.12.1-3 and the Epistle of Ptolemy to Flora, which it quotes in its entirety. See also Hipp. Refut. 6.38.5-7. Both PsT 4.7, which mentions Ptolemy together with Secundus, and Fil. 49, are from Hipp. Synt. which was plainly quite summary.

[2] 1,2-3,5 is partially quoted and partially paraphrased from Iren. 1.12.1-3. Cf. Hipp. Refut. 6.38.5-7.

of a sort of addition to their teaching. (3) "He invented two consorts for the god they call Depth and bestowed them on him; and these he also called 'dispositions,[3] Conception' (ἔννοια) and Will." (4) Conception had always coexisted with him, continually conceiving of the emission of something, but Will arose in him later. "For he first conceived of emitting <something>," Ptolemy says, "and then he willed to. (5) Thus when Conception and Will, these two dispositions or faculties"—in turn he calls them faculties—"had been mixed together as it were, the emission as a pair of Only-Begotten and Truth took place. (6) These came forth as types and visible images of the Father's two invisible dispositions; Mind of Will, and Truth of Conception. And thus the male became an image of <the later> Will, <but> the female, of the ingenerate Conception. (7) Will, then, was a faculty of Conception. For Conception had always conceived of the emission, but was unable by herself to emit what she had conceived of. But when the faculty of Will supervened, she then emitted that of which she had conceived."

2,1 What nonsense of the lame-brain! No one of sound mind could understand this even of man, let alone of God. (2) Homer strikes me as more sensible than he, with his portrayal of Zeus' worrying, fretting and angry, and lying awake all night over a way to plot against the Achaeans, because Thetis had demanded that the Greek leaders, and the Greeks themselves, be punished for their insult to Achilles. (3) For Ptolemy has thought of nothing more suitable in glorification of what he calls Father of all and Depth, than what Homer has said of Zeus. (4) But rather, he has understood him to be "Zeus, as though he had got the notion from Homer. For" <one> may fairly say that when he was belching out such impudence, <he had> "Homer's apprehension" of Zeus and the Achaeans "rather than <that> of the Lord of all, who simultaneously with the conceiving of it has likewise accomplished that which he willed, and simultaneously with the willing also conceives of that which he willed, for he conceives when he wills, and wills when he conceives. (5) He is all conception, all will, all mind, all light, all eye, all ear, all fount of all that is good," and is subject to no vicissitudes. He is God, and not worried or at a loss like Depth, or Zeus. For in speaking of Depth, Ptolemy mimicked Homer speaking of Zeus.

2,6 But next, in further refutation of the fraud, I am going to subjoin and quote the seductive and dangerous words which were actually written by himself to a woman named Flora—lest anyone think that I am refuting the cheat from hearsay only, without becoming acquainted with his phony

[3] With Depth's "two consorts" cf., in a sense, Val. Exp. 24,19-22: He is [one] who appears [in Silence] and [he is] Mind of the All. [He was] dwelling secondarily with Life.

teaching first. For besides the things I have mentioned, he is not ashamed to blaspheme God's Law given through Moses as well. Here are his words:

Ptolemy's Letter to Flora

3,1 After noting the discrepant opinions about it, my good sister Flora, I think you too will see at once that not many before us have understood the Law given through Moses by accurate knowledge either of the Lawgiver himself or of his commandments. (2) For some say it was given by our God and Father but others, taking the direction opposite to theirs, insist that it was given by our adversary the devil, the author of corruption—as, indeed, they ascribe the creation of the world to him, calling him the father and maker of this universe.

3,3 <But> these parties <have certainly> stuttered in singing their rival songs and, each in their own way, have completely missed the truth of the matter. (4) It is evident, since logical, that the Law has not been made by the perfect God and Father, since it is imperfect and in need of fulfillment by another person, and contains ordinances inappropriate to the nature and intention of such a God. (5) Nor, again, <is it appropriate> to attribute to the iniquity of the adversary a Law which abolishes iniquity—<this must be the opinion of fools>, and persons who cannot draw inferences—in accordance with our Savior's words, "A house or city divided against itself cannot stand."[4]

3,6 And further, depriving the liars beforehand of their unfounded wisdom, the apostle says that the creation of the world is <the Savior's>, that all things were made by him and without him nothing is made,[5] and that creation is the work of a righteous God who hates iniquity, not of a god of corruption. <This latter> is the view of thoughtless persons who take no account of the Creator's providence and are blinded, not only in the eye of the soul, but in the eye of the body as well.

3,7 From the foregoing it will be plain to you that they have completely missed the truth. Each party has got into this predicament in its own way—the one through its ignorance of the God of justice; the other through ignorance of the Father of all, whom none but the only One who knows him has come and made known. (8) But as I have been vouchsafed <knowledge> of both, it is left to me to declare to you and accurately describe both the nature of the Law itself and the person by whom it was

[4] Matt 12:25
[5] Cf. John 1:1;3.

given, the lawgiver. I shall provide the proofs of <the> things I shall say from the words of our Savior, by which alone we are surely guided to the perception of the truth.

4,1 First, it must be understood that the whole of that Law which is contained in the five books of Moses has not been made by one legislator. I mean that it has not been made by God alone, but some of its provisions have been made by men. And the words of the Savior teach us that it is triply divided. (2) It is divided into (the words of) God himself and his legislation, but <it> is also <divided> into (the words of) Moses—not as God legislates through him, but as Moses too made certain provisions of his own notion. And it is divided into (the words of) the elders of the people, for it is plain that <they> too have inserted certain commandments of their own.

4,3 You may now learn how the truth of this can be proved from the words of the Savior. (4) In the Savior's discussion with those who were disputing with him about the bill of divorce—the bill which had been sanctioned by the Law—the Savior told them, "Moses for the hardness of your hearts permitted a man to divorce his wife. For from the beginning it was not so. For God," he said, "hath joined this pair together, and what the Lord hath joined," he said, "let not man put asunder."[6] (5) Here he proves that <the> Law of God, which forbids the separation of a wife from her husband, is one law; but the law of Moses, which permits this couple's separation because of the hardness of their hearts, is another.

4,6 Indeed, in this case Moses is giving a law contrary to God's, for separating is contrary to not <separating>. If, however, we examine Moses' purpose in making this law, we shall find that he made it not of his own choice but of necessity, owing to the frailty of those for whom the laws were made. (7) They could not honor God's intention if forbidden to divorce their wives with whom some were living unwillingly, and so risking being turned further to wickedness and consequent destruction. (8) On his own initiative then, to end this discontent by which they were risking destruction as well, Moses gave them a second law, the law of the bill of divorce, as though exchanging, in a pinch, a lesser evil for a greater. (9) Thus if they could not keep the former law, they would at least keep this, and not be turned to iniquities and evils from which their utter destruction would result. (10) This is Moses' intent in the instances in which he makes laws contrary to God's. Still it is undeniable that Moses' law is here shown to

[6] Matt 19:8;6

be other than God's, even if for the present we have proved it from (only) one example.

4,11 That certain traditions of the elders have been intermingled with the Law the Savior also makes plain. "For God said, Honor thy father and thy mother that it may be well with thee," he says. (12) "But ye," he says, speaking to the elders, "have said, That wherewith thou mightest be profited by me is a gift to God; and ye have nullified the Law of God by the tradition of you elders. (13) And Isaiah cried this out when he said, 'This people honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.'"[7] (14) From these passages, then, it is plainly shown that that Law as a whole is divided into three. For in it we have found Moses' own legislation, the legislation of the elders, and the legislation of God himself. And this division of that Law as a whole which I have made here has made clear what in it is true.

5,1 But the one portion, the Law of God himself, is again divided into some three parts. It is divided into the pure legislation with no admixture of evil, which is properly termed the "law" which the Savior came not to destroy but to fulfill. (For that which he fulfilled was not foreign to him <but was in need of fulfillment>, for it was incomplete.) It is also divided into law mixed with inferior matter and injustice, which the Savior abolished as incongruous with his nature. (2) And it is divided also into the typical and allegorical legislation in the image of things that are spiritual and excellent. This the Savior transformed from the perceptible and phenomenal into the spiritual and invisible.

5,3 And the Law of God, the pure Law unmixed with inferior matter, is the Decalogue itself—those ten commandments engraved on the two tablets to prohibit what must be eschewed and enjoin what must be done. These were in need of fulfillment by the Savior, for though they contained the legislation in its pure form they were incomplete.

5,4 The law intemingled with injustice is the law which regards retribution and the requital of those who committed the prior injustice, and enjoins the knocking out of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, and the retribution of a murder with a murder.[8] For the second offender does no less of an injustice and commits the same act, changing it merely in its order. (5) In any case this commandment was and is just, though owing to

---

[7] Isa 29:13; Matt 15:4-9

[8] Cf. Lev 24:20.

the frailty of its recipients it was given in violation of the pure law. But it is not in accord with the nature and goodness of the Father of all. (6) It is perhaps appropriate, but is rather a matter of necessity. For in requiring the murderer to be murdered in retaliation, making a second law, and presiding over two murders after forbidding the one, he who opposed even the one murder by saying, "Thou shalt not kill"[9] was an unwitting victim of necessity. (7) Thus the Son who came from him has abolished this portion of the Law, while acknowledging that it too was a law of God—<just as> he has shown agreement with the old school, both in other matters and in his words, "It is God who said, He that curseth father or mother, let him die the death."[10]

5,8 But this is the typical portion of the Law, the part that has been made the image of things which are spiritual and excellent, I mean the laws of sacrifices, circumcision, the Sabbath, fasting, the Passover, the feast of unleavened bread and the like. (9) For all these, being images and allegories, were transformed when the truth appeared. Outwardly and in bodily observance they were abrogated but spiritually they were adopted, with the names remaining the same but the things altered. (10) For the Savior has commanded us to offer sacrifices, not of dumb animals or their odors but by means of spiritual hymns, praises, and thanksgiving, and of charity and acts of kindness to our neighbors. (11) He also desires that we have a circumcision, not of the bodily foreskin but of the spiritual heart—(12) <and> that we keep the Sabbath, for it is his will that we desist from evil works. (13) And that we fast—but it is his will that we keep not the bodily fast but the spiritual, which includes abstinence from all evil.

We do observe outward fasting however, since this can be of some use to the soul as well when done with reason—not in mimicry of someone or by custom, or for the sake of a day, as though a day were set aside <for> it. (14) At the same time it serves as a reminder of the true fast, so that those who are as yet unable to keep that may have a reminder of it through the outward fasting.

5,15 That both the Passover and Feast of Unleavened Bread were likewise images, Paul the apostle makes plain by saying, "As our Passover, Christ has been sacrificed," and, "that ye may be unleavened, not partaking of leaven"—by "leaven" here he means evil—"but that ye may be a new lump.[11]

---

[9] Exod 20:15
[10] Matt 15:4
[11] 1 Cor 5:7

6,1 Thus even the Law which is acknowledged to be God's is divided into three—into the part which is fulfilled by the Savior (for "Thou shalt not kill," "Thou shalt not commit adultery," and "Thou shalt not bear false witness" are included in his prohibition of anger, lust and oaths). (2) And also into the part that is annulled altogether, for "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth,"[12] which is intermingled with injustice and itself contains an act of injustice, was annulled by the Savior through its opposites. (3) But opposites have the property of canceling each other: "For I say unto you that ye resist not evil by any means, but if a man smite thee, turn to him the other cheek also."[13] (4) There is also the division which has been transformed and altered from the physical to the spiritual—this allegorical legislation in the image of the things that are excellent. (5) For since the images and allegories were indicative of other things, they were rightly performed as long as the truth was not here. But once the truth is here we must do what is proper to the truth, not to the image.

6,6 The Savior's disciples have given proof of these divisions, and so has the apostle Paul. For our sakes he gave proof of the part which consists of images with (his remarks about) the Passover and Feast of Unleavened Bread, as we have said already. And of the part which consists of the law which is mixed with injustice by saying, "The law of commandments contained in ordinances is abolished."[14] And of the part which consists of the law with no admixture of inferior matter by saying, "The Law is holy, and the commandment holy and just and good."[15]

7,1 I think you have been given sufficient proof, so far as this can be done concisely, of the human legislation which has invaded the Law, and of God's Law itself with its triple division. (2) It remains for me to say who this God is who has made the Law. But I feel that this too has been shown you in my earlier remarks, if you have listened attentively. (3) If, as we have explained, the Law was not given by the perfect God himself, and certainly not by the devil—it is not proper even to say this—then this lawgiver is someone other than these. (4) But this is the demiurge and maker of this entire world and everything in it. As he differs from the essences of the other two <and> stands in between them, he may properly be titled "The Intermediate." (5) And if, by his own nature, the perfect God is good—as indeed he is, for our Savior has declared that his Father, whom he made

[12] Matt 5:38
[13] Matt 5:39
[14] Cf. Eph. 2:15.
[15] Rom 7:12

manifest, is the one and only good God—[16] and if a god of the adversary's nature is evil and is marked as wicked by his injustice—then a God who stands between them, and is neither good[17] nor, certainly, evil or unjust, may properly be called "just,"[18] being the arbiter of his sort of justice.

7,6 As he is generate, not ingenerate, this God will naturally be weaker than the perfect God and inferior to his righteousness (there is one Ingenerate, the Father, of whom are all things since all things, each in its own way, have been framed by him. But he will be greater and possessed of more authority than the adversary, and will be of an essence and nature different from the essence of either of these. (7) For the essence of the adversary is corruption and darkness, since he is material and composite. The essence of the unbegotten Father of all is incorruption and self-existent light, simple and uniform. And the essence of this God has shown a sort of dual capacity, but in himself he is the image of the better.

7,8 Do not let this disturb you for now, even though you desire to learn how these natures, that of corruption and that < of > the intermediate, natures which differ in kind, arose from one first principle of all, one which is < simple > and is confessed and believed by us, the unbegotten, imperishable and good—though it is the nature of the good to beget and bring forth its like and its own kind. (9) God willing, you shall learn both their origin and their generation next, since you are adjudged worthy of the apostolic tradition which I have received in my turn, together with the assessment of all its statements by the standard of our Savior's teaching.

7,10 I have not begrudged[19] you these things which have been said in a few words, my sister Flora, and have set forth the brief statement of them, at the same time making the matter sufficiently plain. They will be of the utmost value to you in what follows as well, if, like good soil, hospitable to fertile seeds, you bear the fruit which is their product.

This concludes the letter to Flora

8,1 Who can put up with these words and the idiocy of this charlatan and his supporters—I mean Ptolemy and his circle, who concoct fabrications at such length and baste them together? (2) None of the ancient tragic poets, nor the imitative ones after them—I mean Philistion, and Diogenes who

[16] Cf. Matt. 19:17;

[17] This is said of the ὑλικὸς θεός, the καλὸς κόσμος at Corp. Herm. 10.10.

[18] Cf. Cod. Tch. James 18,16-20: But watch out, because the just God is angry, for you have been a servant to him, and that is why you received the name, "James the Just."

[19] Adopting Petavius' conjecture, ἐφθόνησα, for text ἠτόνησα

composed incredible yarns, or all the others who wrote the myths down and recited them, (3) could make up as much falsehood as these people have manufactured horrors for themselves in their impudent attack on their own life, and have smothered their converts' minds with foolish questions and endless genealogies. (4) In fact they themselves did not understand what was under their noses, and yet they professed to survey the heavens with measurements of some sort, and adopted the profession of midwives as though for some heavenly mothers—for non-existent mothers as though they existed. (5) When one hears this from them—if he is a complete fool—he will think that he has learned something sublime from them and easily be swept off his feet by the lie. (Scripture says, "Every bird flocketh with its kind, and a man will cleave to his like.")[20] (6) But if a person of understanding and sound reason should happen on them he will laugh at so much silliness, and from the very subject of the things they say will know the refutation of them. For they are convicted in every way of arming their useless labor's lies against themselves.

8,7 Where did you learn Depth's dimensions, you gentleman and lady Ptolemaeans? And the pregnant mothers' deliveries, and the reasons they got pregnant? (8) You profess to give us the knowledge, as though you had been there and seen the origins of the heavenly beings, as though you were in existence before your so-called Depth himself. (9) But no prophet has ever said this, not Moses himself, not the prophets before him, not the prophets after him, not the evangelists, not the apostles—unless you mean the works of heathen mythology by Orpheus, Hesiod, Hicesius and Stesichorus, in whose writings the generations of men have been turned into names of gods, and human doings made into dramatic poetry. (10) For they too held beliefs of this kind <and>, by making gods of Zeus, Rhea, Hera, Athena, Apollo and Aphrodite and honoring the children of their wickedness, they pushed the world into a delusion of polytheism and idolatry.

8,11 But I won't have much further need for the refutation and rebuttal of you and your kind, Ptolemy, since your forebears have already received the refutation in sufficient measure. Since I have achieved your disgrace through the things I have said, I am going over imposture of the others—calling on God as the aid of my meager ability so that, in every people, I may discover the doctrine they have wickedly invented and make a spectacle of it. And I ask God's grace for my zealous undertaking.

---

[20] Sir 13:16

9,1 However, Ptolemy, not to leave unchallenged the three little literary efforts, the ones you boasted of sending to your girlfriend Flora—(the teachings of serpents always "deceive silly women laden with sins,"[21] as the apostle said).—I have quoted the words themselves here at the right time, and will next give their corresponding refutation—an essential one, or the the root of your tare-like crop might be left.

9,2 You claim that the Law has three divisions, Mister, and that one owes something to God, but one comes from Moses and one from the elders. (3) You can't show <the part> you think was written by the elders; this much is plain. The traditions of the elders are nowhere to be found in the Law. From your ignorance both of the books and of the truth you are imagining these by misrepresenting <and altering> the consequences of every kind of accurate knowledge. (4) The traditions of the elders are called "repetitions"[22] by the Jews, and there are four of them. One is circulated in the name of Moses, a second in that of the person named Rabbi Aqiba, a third of Adda or Judah, and a fourth of the sons of Hasmonaeus. (5) Where, you trouble-maker with your erratic judgment, can you show that the words mentioned by the Savior—"He who shall say to his father Korban, that is, a gift, he shall profit nothing from him"[23]—were said in the five books of the Pentateuch and God's legislation? (6) You can't show it. Your argument has failed then, since the saying is nowhere to be found in the Pentateuch, and you have deceived your dupe Flora for nothing.

9,7 And neither were the laws given by Moses given independently of God. They came from God through Moses, as is shown by the Savior's own verification (of the fact). The very texts you have brought forward, you have assembled against yourself. (8) In the Gospel the Lord says, "Moses wrote for the hardness of your hearts."[24] But what Moses wrote, he did not write independently of God's will; his legislation was inspired by the Holy Spirit.

9,9 For the Lord in the Gospel said, "That which God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." And to let us know how God joined them, he explained it fully <by affixing> the saying, "For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother and shall cleave to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh." (10) He then adds, "That which *God* hath joined

[21] 2 Tim 3:6
[22] δευτερώσεις, in Hebrew, mishnahs
[23] Matt 19:6
[24] Matt 19:8

together, let not man put asunder[25]—although the Lord said nothing like this at the time when he formed Adam and Eve, but only, "Let us make him an helpmeet like himself.[26]" (11) Those words were said by Adam when he awoke and said, "This is now bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh. She shall be called wife, for she was taken out of her husband."[27]—And then *he* says, "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh."[28]

9,12 Now since God did not say this but Adam did, and yet the Lord in the Gospel testifies that the words spoken through Adam were God's, by his statement itself he proved that in the one case[29] Adam spoke but uttered the words by God's will, while in this one[30] Moses made a law because God had commanded the legislation. (13) And that the making of laws is God's business; this is plain. But God makes laws everywhere, some temporary, some typical, and some to reveal the good things to come, whose fulfillment our Lord Jesus Christ, when he had come, made known in the Gospel.

10,1 But I shall take up your other distinction of gods—again, a triple distinction—and show that this too is slander on your part and simply the work of a charlatan. (2) What sort of third God do we have here—made up of two likenesses although he is neither of the two, having no wickedness or injustice, as you said, and no goodness or luminous essence either, but right in between, "just?" (3) As you are in fact strange to all justice you naturally do not know what justice is, and so you think it is something other than goodness. You'll get good and refuted you tamperer, you stranger to the truth! Justice comes from nowhere but from goodness, and no one can become good other than by being just.

10,4 And so, to praise the legislation and its just men, the Lord said, "Ye garnish the tombs of the prophets, and build the sepulchres of the just, and your fathers killed them."[31] But where have prophets and just men come from, if not from the Father's goodness? (5) And, to prove that the just man belongs in the category of goodness, he said, "Be ye like unto your Father which is in heaven, for he maketh his sun to rise on good and evil, and sendeth rain on just and unjust,"[32] to make it plain that just is good and good is just, and that evil is unjust, and unjust, evil.

---

[25] Matt 19:6
[26] Gen 2:18
[27] Gen 2:23
[28] Gen 2:24
[29] Gen 2:24
[30] Cf. Deut 24:1.
[31] Matt 23:29; Luke 11:47
[32] Matt 5:45

10,6 Nor can you prove the Law's intermixture (with evil) of which you spoke. You have been caught making a false accusation against the Law by your ascription of some intermixture to it because the Law has said, "eye for eye and tooth for tooth,"[33] and because the Law murders the murderer. (7) But it will be shown, from our Lord Jesus Christ's own treatment of the matter, that there was no intermixture, but that the legislation was the same and had the same effect as the commandment given by the Savior, "If a man smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also."[34] (8) For the Law <too> ensured this long ago by saying "an eye for an eye," or in other words, "Turn your other cheek to him." To avoid what would happen to him if he struck a blow, a man would present his cheek to the one who was striking him—knowing that if he put an eye out, he would suffer the same because of the Law.

11,1 A father who wishes to discipline his children progresses with the discipline by suiting it to each age. He surely does not discipline a little baby like a boy, a boy like a youth, or a youth like a grown man. (2) An infant is disciplined with a finger, an older child with the slap of a hand, a boy with a strap, and a youth with a cane. But by law a man is punished with the sword for the more serious offenses. Thus the Lord too, in consequence, made the laws that were suitable for each generation. (3) He chastened the earlier one with fear, as though he were speaking with little children who did not know the power of the Holy Spirit, but he considered full grown adults worthy of full mysteries. (4) For in the Gospel as well, in many places, he <tells> the disciples something like, "Ye know not what I do, but ye shall know hereafter[35]—that is, "when you grow up." And again, "They knew not until he was risen from the dead."[36] (5) And Paul says, "Ye were not able, neither yet are ye able,"[37] to show that commandments become more advanced as time goes on—the same ones, but changed to another form, formulated in one way for the young; in another for the more mature.

11,6 For when the Law enjoined "an eye for an eye,"[38] it did not tell them, "Put one eye out after another," but, "If someone puts an eye out, the eye of the one who put it out will be put out." And to spare his own body, everyone would present his cheek to be struck, and not strike himself. (7) And what is now stated clearly in the Gospel was observed from that

---

[33] Lev 24:17;20
[34] Matt 5:39
[35] John 13:7
[36] John 2:22
[37] 1 Cor 3:2
[38] Lev 24:20

time on—by compulsion then, as though children were being trained, but now by choice, since adults are being pesuaded.

11,8 But if you claim that this is an involvement—to say "an eye for an eye" and have a murderer put to death—then observe! Even of the day of judgment we see the Savior saying, "His Lord shall come"—but he was saying this of himself, since he is Lord of all—and he says, "and cut the servant himself asunder and appoint his portion with the unbelievers."[39] In other words, by quibbling about words again you are taking up arms even against the Savior; and you would say that he is not good but just—although he is begotten of a good Father, and is good himself—and is different from the Father. (10) So you are capable of separating even him from the nature of the Father, Mister—you who appear before us once more as a dissector and surveyor of the laws, dividing everything into threes!

11,11 And by saying that some things in the Law are written allegorically, as types, you have touched on little bits of the truth, so that with the little bits you can fool people in the other points. (12) "These things" indeed "happened unto them typically, and were written for our admonition on whom the ends of the ages have come"[40] <as> the most holy apostle says, speaking of circumcision, the Sabbath and so on. (13) If only you would tell the truth about everything, and not inflict your nonexistent third, intermediate God on us any more—or rather, not inflict him on yourself any more, and on your dupes!

12,1 But by now, you tramp, I feel that enough has also been said about your remarks. Having refuted them I shall go to the remaining sects, calling as usual on the same God to aid my meager ability in making plain the rebuttal of every distorted heresy. (2) For by what has been said it has been shown that Ptolemy deceived Flora and others with her with a letter as though he had risen out of the sea, summoning sharks and a viper with his own piping. (3) But by entangling him in the net of the truth—the symbolic meaning of which the Lord in the Gospel declared to be the kingdom of heaven—and by exposing him as one of the bad fish by bringing his unsound words to light, we have overcome him with the teaching of the true faith. (4) Having thrashed him by the power of God let us give thanks to God ourselves, and set ourselves, as I said, to go on to the rest as well.

---

[39] Matt 24:50-51
[40] 1 Cor 10:11

ANACEPHALAEOSIS III

Here, also, are the contents of the third Section of the first Volume, which contains thirteen Sects.

34,1 34. Marcosians. A certain Marcus was Colorbasus' fellow student, and he too introduces two first principles. He denies the resurrection of the dead and initiates his female dupes <by creatingc some sort of illusions with chalices <which are turned> dark blue, and purple, by incantation. (2) Like Valentinus, he too holds that everything <is made up> of the twenty-four sounds of the alphabet.

35,1 35. Colorbasus. Colorbasus likewise described the same things but differed somewhat from the other sects, I mean those of Marcus and Valentinus, and taught the emanations and ogdoads differently.

36,1 36. Heracleonites too are carried away with the mythology of the ogdoads, but differently from Marcus, Ptolemy, Valentinus and the others. (2) Moreover, like Marcus they "redeem" their dying members at the end with oil, balsam and water, and pronounce certain Hebrew invocations over the head of the one being supposedly redeemed.

37,1 37. Ophites, the persons who honor the serpent and regard him as Christ, and have an actual snake, the familiar reptile, in a basket of some sort.

38,1 38. Cainites who, together with their predecessors, similarly repudiate the Law and the One who spoke in the Law, deny the resurrection of the flesh and honor Cain, saying that he belongs to the stronger power. (2) But together with him they also deify Judas, together with the company of Korah, Dathan, Abiram, and the Sodomites besides.

39,1 39. Sethians. These in turn honor Seth and claim that he is the child of the Mother on high, who repented of having emitted Cain and then, after the banishment of Cain and the killing of Abel, had congress with the Father on high and, as a pure seed, bore Seth, from whom all humanity was then derived. (2) They too taught about first principles and authorities, and all the doctrines the others taught.

40,1 40. Archontics. These in turn trace the universe to many archons and say that all that has come to be has come from them. And they are also guilty of certain shameful behavior. (2) They reject the resurrection of the flesh and slander the Old Testament. But they use both the Old and the New Testaments, though they handle every saying to suit themselves.

41,1 41. Cerdonians, founded by Cerdo, <who> got his share of the imposture in succession from Heracleon but added to the deceit. He moved from Syria to Rome and preached his doctrine during the episcopate of Hyginus. (2) He declares that two first principles are in opposition to one another, and that Christ is not begotten. He likewise repudiates the resurrection of the dead and the Old Testament.

42,1 42. Marcionites. Marcion of Pontus was the son of a bishop, but he seduced a virgin and went into exile because he was excommunicated by his own father. (2) Arriving at Rome he asked for penance from the <elders> of the time. Since he could not get it he grew angry and taught doctrines contrary to the faith by introducing three first principles, a good, a just and an evil, and saying that the New Testament is foreign to the Old, and to the One who spoke in it.

42,3 He rejects the resurrection of the flesh and administers not just one baptism, but even two and three after lapses into sin. When catechumens die other Marcionites are baptized for them. He unhesitantly allows even women to administer supposed baptism.

43,1 43. Lucianists. An ancient Lucian—not the modern one who was born in Constantine's time—taught doctrines in all respects like Marcion's. But he too, if you please, has further doctrines different from Marcion's.

44,1 44. Apelleans. This Apelles too, like Marcion and Lucian, disparages all of creation and the creator. (2) But unlike them he did not teach three first principles but one first principle and one God, supernal and unnameable, and that he, the one God, has made another. And this God who had been made turned out to be bad, and in his badness made the world.

45,1 45. Severians. A certain Severus in turn, a follower of Apelles, rejects wine and the vine and relates the myth that it was born of the dragon-like Satan and earth, who had had relations with each other. (2) He rejects woman, claiming that she belongs to the left hand power. (3) He introduces certain names of archons as well as certain uncanonical books. Like the other sects he rejects the resurrection of the flesh and the Old Testament.

46,1 46. Tatianists. Tatian flourished in company with the holy martyr Justin who was also a philosopher. But after Justin, the martyr and philosopher, died, Tatian unfortunately became acquainted with Marcion's doctrines, was instructed by him, and both taught the same doctrines as he and added others besides his. He is said to have come from Mesopotamia.

This will summarize the three Sections of Volume One, containing forty-six sects.

34.
Against Marcosians.[1] *Number fourteen, but thirty-four of the series*

1,12[2] A certain Marcus, the founder of the so-called Marcosians, came from the Gnostics and dared to vomit evils into the world that were different from theirs. For he succeeded Secundus, Epiphanes, Ptolemy and Valentinus, but was inspired to gather a further crowd of tramps. (2) For the wretch attracted female and male dupes of his own, and was supposed to be a corrector of the cheats we have mentioned since he was the most adept in magical trickery. (3) But because he deceived all these men and women into regarding him as the most gnostic of all and possessed of the greatest power from the unseen, ineffable realms, he has truly been shown to be the forerunner of the Antichrist. (4) For by combining Anaxilaus' jokes with the villainy of the so-called magicians, and deceiving and bewitching the people who saw and trusted him with these, he drove them to distraction—as his followers still manage to do, even today.

1,5 The people who see the <effects> that have been produced by jugglery suppose that miracles of some sort are being performed by the hands of Marcus and such Marcosians as do these things. (6) For they have lost their minds themselves and, because they do not know how to evaluate it, they do not see that his stunt, as we might call it, has been performed by magic. For they have become completely cracked themselves from being carried away with an wrong opinion.

1,7 It is said that they prepare three chalices of white vinegar mixed with white wine, and during the incantation Marcus gives, his supposed eucharistic prayer, these are suddenly transformed, with one <turning> red as blood, another purple, and another dark blue. (8) But for my part, so as not to commit myself to a second hard task I feel I should be content with the work written against Marcus himself and his successors by the most holy and blessed Irenaeus. I hasten to publish this here word for word, and it runs as follows. For St. Irenaeus himself says the following in his disclosure of the things they did:

---

[1] Sect 34 is entirely dependent upon Iren. 1.13.1-21.4, which it quotes verbatim. Hipp. Refut. 6.39.1ff also reproduces Irenaeus. PsT 5 which mentions Colorbasus in combination with Marcus, and Fil. 42, are based on Hipp. Synt. but give no detalis which are significantly different from Irenaeus.

[2] 1.1-3 is paraphrased from Iren. 1.13.1.

From the writings of St. Irenaeus[3]

2,1 Pretending to consecrate liquids mixed with wine and spinning his invocation out at length, he makes them turn purple and scarlet. It thus seems that Grace, from the realms above the universe, is shedding drops of her blood into his cup at his invocation. And the onlookers are most eager for a taste of that drink, so that the Grace who is being summoned by this magician may shower on them as well.

2,2 Again, he would hand chalices already mixed to women and tell them to consecrate them with him standing by. And when they had, he would bring another chalice out, much larger than the one his dupe had consecrated, empty the smaller one consecrated by the woman into the one he had brought in <and say the eucharistic prayer> adding the words, (3) "May she that is before all, the inconceivable and ineffable Grace, fill thine inner man and increase in thee her knowledge, by sowing the grain of the mustard seed in the good ground." (4) And after he had said things of this sort and had driven the wretched woman to madness it would appear that he was a wonder worker, for the big chalice would be filled from the little one so as even to overflow from it. And by doing other things quite like these he has fooled many people completely and won them to his following.

2,5 He probably has a familiar spirit too, through which he both appears to prophesy himself, and causes such women as he considers worthy of <becoming> participants in his grace to prophesy. (6) (He spends most of his time on women, and the best-dressed, highest-ranking and wealthiest of these.) In the effort to get them in his power he often tells them in flattering terms, "I desire to share my grace with you, for the Father of all continually beholds your angel before his face. But the Majesty's place is in us; we must be restored to the One. (7) First receive Grace from me and through me. Prepare yourself as a bride awaiting her bridegroom, that you may be what I am, and I what you are. Plant the seed of the light in your bridal chamber.[4] Receive the bridegroom from me; contain him and be contained in him. Lo, Grace has descended upon you; open your mouth and prophesy!"

2,8 But if the woman answers, "I have never prophesied and don't know how," he gives another set of invocations to his dupe's consternation,

---

[3] This begins the quotation of Iren. 1.13.1-21.4.

[4] In Gos. Phil. the bridal chamber may mean baptism, the entire Christian initiation rite, or the kingdom of God. At 69,1-70,3 it might mean the eucharist. For other occurrences of the term see 67,23-26; 74,13-24; 82,23-29. On the subject see Schenke, *Philippus-Evangelium.* See also Exeg. Soul 132,12-26.

and tells her, "Open your mouth <and> say any old thing, and you will be prophesying!"

2,9 And made conceited and feather-brained by this, fevered in soul with the expectation that she is going to prophesy, with her heart beating harder than it should, she (10) will pluck up the courage to babble silly things at random—all vainly and impudently, since she has been made feverish by a vain spirit. (As a greater man than I has said of such <prophets>, "An impudent and shameless thing is a soul made feverish by empty air.") (11) And from then on she takes herself for a prophetess and is grateful to Marcus for bestowing his own grace on her, and attempts to repay him not only with the gift of her money—he has amassed considerable wealth in this way—but with bodily union too. For she is eager to be altogether united with him, so as to be restored to the One with him.

2,12 Already—though he took care to cajole them like the rest by telling them to prophesy—some of the more faithful women, who fear God and were not fooled, have spat, cursed, and abandoned such a charlatan as this, <who pretends to breathe something divine (into them)>. (13) They know perfectly well that prophecy is not engendered in men by the sorcerer Marcus. Those to whom God sends his grace from above possess prophecy as a divine gift and speak where and when God wills, not when Marcus says to. (14) A thing that gives an order is greater and more authoritative than a thing that is given an order, since the one takes precedence while the other is subject. Hence if Marcus or anyone else, orders prophecy—and at their dinners they make a regular game of having each other prophesy <by> lot, and divine for them as their passions dictate—then, though he is only a man, the one who orders it is greater than the prophetic spirit and possessed of more authority. But that is not possible. (15) Such spirits as are at their bidding and speak when they choose, are earthy and feeble, although presumptuous and impudent. They are sent by Satan for the deception and ruin of those who fail to maintain in its vigor the faith they received through the church at the outset.

3,1 But that Marcus administers philtres and love-potions to some if not all of the women in order to outrage their bodies as well, they have often confessed on returning to God's church—and to having been corrupted in body by him, and having loved him with great passion. (2) Even one of our deacons in Asia had this misfortune because he welcomed Marcus into his home. His wife was a handsome woman, and she was seduced both in mind and body by this sorcerer, and followed him for a long time. (3) Then, when the brethren had brought her to repentance with great difficulty, she spent the rest of her life in confession, mourning and lamenting her seduction by the magician.

3,4 Certain of his disciples too, who wander about in the same area, have deceived and seduced many women by proclaiming themselves so perfect that no one can equal the greatness of their knowledge—not even Paul or Peter or any other apostle. (5) (They) claim that <they> know more than everyone, that they alone have drunk in the greatness of the knowledge of the ineffable power, and that they are higher than any power. (6) Hence they can do everything freely[5] and have no fear in anything. Because of their redemption they have become untouchable by the judge, and invisible to him. But even if he were to apprehend them they would stand before him with their redemption and say this:[6]

3,7 "O Counselor of God and the primordial mysterious Silence, <through whom> the Majesties, who ever behold the Father's face, draw their forms heavenward with thee as their leader and guide,—the forms that First Progenitor's goodness, that audacious one, imagined,[7]—who then had a dreamlike notion of the things on high and emitted us <in their image>—(8) Lo, the judge is nigh and the herald bids me offer my defense. But do thou, as understanding the case of us both, render an account for <us> both, as one, to the judge!" (9) And the Mother hears them without delay and puts Homer's helmet of invisibility on them, so that they escape the judge unseen,[8] and drawing them up instantly conducts them to the marriage chamber and gives them to their bridegrooms.

3,10 By saying and doing such things they have completely fooled many women in our own area, the Rhone valley, as well. Branded in conscience some of these women even make open confession. Others, who are ashamed to do this but have quietly <withdrawn> themselves somehow, despair of God's life and in some cases have become entirely apostate; while others vacillate, in the proverbial predicament of being neither in nor out—having this fruit from the seed of the children of knowledge!

4,1 This Marcus <then>, says that he and he alone in his uniqueness has become the womb and receptacle of Colorbasus' Silence and brought forth the actual <seed> of Defect,[9] which has somehow been sown in him here. (2) The all-sublime Tetrad has descended to him herself, from the invisible, ineffable realms, in feminine form[10]—because the world

---

[5] Cf. Corp. Herm. 9.4, πάντα γὰρ τῷ τοιούτῳ, κἂν τοῖς ἄλλοις τὰ κακά, ἀγαθά ἐστί.
[6] See p. 104 n. 72.
[7] Cf. "those that had come forth from him in an imaginary way" Tri. Trac. 78,6-7.
[8] Cf. Gos. Phil. 70,5-9; 76,22-29.
[9] This may be the source of Epiph's confusion about "Defect." See p. 170 n. 9.
[10] Tri. Prot. 42,17-18: Now I have come the second time in the likeness of a female and

could not bear her masculine one, he says—disclosed who she was and to him and him alone explained the origin of all things, which she had never revealed to any god or man, speaking as follows:

4,3[11] "When, at the first, the Father <of whom none is the father>, who is inconceivable and without essence, who is neither male nor female, willed that his unutterability become utterable and his invisibility be given form,[12] he opened his mouth and uttered a word[13] like himself. This stood by him and showed him what he was, itself manifest as a form of the invisible.[14] (4) But the pronunciation of the name was as follows: He spoke the first word of his name, which was a "beginning," and its syllable was of four sounds. <And> he subjoined the second syllable, and it too was of four sounds. Next he pronounced the third, and it was a syllable of ten sounds. And he spoke the final one, and it was of twelve sounds. The pronouncing of the entire name, then, became thirty sounds but four syllables.

4,5[15] "Each of the sounds has its own letters, its own impress, and its own pronunciation, forms and representations. There is not one of them that sees the form of that of which it is a sound. Nor can it know it[16] nor, certainly, the pronunciation of its neighbor but, as though it were pronouncing the All, it thinks that what <it> pronounces names the whole. (6) For though each of them is a part of the whole, it makes its own sound as though it had named the All, and does not stop making it until, with its one utterance, it reaches the last letter of the last sound."

4,7 She said that the restoration of all things will come when all have arrived at the one letter, and sound the same exclamation. She supposed that "Amen," when we say it together, is an image of this exclamation. It is the utterances which give form to the Aeon which has no essence and is ingenerate. And they are forms which the Lord has termed "angels" and continually behold the Father's face.[17] (8) She called the common, spoken

---

have spoken with them; Tri. Trac. 64,32-37: if he had formerly revealed himself suddenly to all the exalted ones among the aeons who had come forth from him, they would have perished.

[11] With 4,3-9 cf. Hipp. Refut. 6.42.2-45.1.

[12] Cf. Tri. Trac. 5;7,24-31; 66,13-19; 67,18-19.

[13] The Son is "the word of [the] unutterable" at Tri. Trac. 66,15-16. Perhaps cf. Thunder 14,9-15.

[14] The First Father beholds himself within himself at Eug. 74,21-75,12 = SJC 98,24-99,13.

[15] With what follows perhaps cf. Thunder 20,32-35: I am the name of the sound, and the sound of the name. I am the sign of the letter and the designation of the division.

[16] Cf. the ignorance of the aeons at Tri. Trac. 60,16-26; 72,22-29. But unlike the sounds here, the aeons are said not to speak.

[17] Cf. Matt 18:10.

names of the sounds Aeons, words, roots, seeds, fullnesses and fruits, but said that the individual names peculiar to each one are observably included in the church's name.

4,9 The last letter of the <last> of these sounds sent forth its voice. <The> echo of it came forth in the image of the sounds, and generated sounds of its own. From these, she says, the things here have been reconstituted,[18] and the things before them generated. (10) But the letter itself, she said, whose echo was simultaneous with the echo below, was taken up on high by its own syllable for the completion of the whole.[19] The echo, as though cast outside, has remained below.

4,11 The sound itself, she says, from which the letter, together with its own pronunciation, came below, is of thirty letters. Each of the thirty letters contains other letters, the ones by which the letter's name is said. (12) And the other letters are named with other letters in turn, and the others with others, so that the number of the letters is infinite. But you can understand this better from the following example:

5,1 The sound, delta, contains five letters: delta itself, epsilon, lamda, tau and alpha. These letters, in turn, are written with other letters and the others with others. (2) Now if the entire essence of the delta is infinite, with other letters continually generating others and succeeding each other, how much greater than that sound is the sea of the letters! (3) And if the one letter is infinite in this way, see the depth of the letters of the whole name of which Marcus' Silence held that First Progenitor is made! (4) Hence the Father, who knows that nothing can contain the name, has permitted each of the sounds—which he also calls Aeons—to cry its own pronunciation aloud, since one cannot pronounce the whole.

5,5 After explaining this to him Tetrad said, "Now I wish to show you the Truth herself. I have brought her down from the habitations on high so that you may see her naked and observe her beauty—hear her speak, moreover, and admire her wisdom. (6) See her head, alpha and omega, at the top. Her neck, beta and psi. Her shoulders and arms, gamma and chi. Her breasts, delta and phi. Her diaphragm, epsilon and ypsilon. Her belly, zeta and tau. Her privy parts, eta and sigma. Her thighs, theta and rho. Her knees, iota and pi. Her shins, kappa and omicron. Her ankles, lamda and xi. Her feet, mu and nu." This, according to the sorcerer, is the body

---

[18] διακεκοσμῆσθαι, the Stoic term for the reconstitution of the universe after its destruction by fire, see Hipp. Refut. Also possible is γεγεννῆσθαι.

[19] Cf. Tri. Trac. 86,4-15: the one who ran on high; Mars. 9,28-10,2: [the] invisible [Spirit] ran up to his place.

of "Truth," this is the form of the sound, this is the impress of the letter. (7) He also calls this sound "Man," and says it is the source of all speech, the origin of every sound, the utterance of everything unutterable, and the mouth of the Silence who cannot be spoken of.

5,8 "And this is her body. But raising <the> thought of your mind aloft, hear from the Truth's own mouth the self-begetting utterance, dispenser of fatherly bounty."

6,1 When Tetrad had said this, Truth looked at him, opened her mouth, and spoke a word. But the word was a name, and the name was the one we know and say, "Christ Jesus." And after naming it she fell silent at once. (2) But while Marcus was waiting for her to say something further, Tetrad came forward again and said, (3) "How trivial you considered the word you heard from the lips of Truth! The one you know, and think you <have> always <had>, is not a name. You have only a sound; you do not know its meaning.[20] (4) 'Jesous' is a notable[21] name of six letters known by all who are called. But the name as known to the Aeons of the Pleroma is complex, and is of a different form and a different impression, known by those brethren whose Majesties are always in its presence.[22]

6,5 "Learn, then, that these twenty-four letters of your alphabet are effluences in the image of the three powers which comprise the sum total of the powers on high. (6)[23] Regard the nine mute consonants as images of the Father and Truth, for they are "mute"—that is, ineffable and unutterable. (7) Regard the voiced consonants, of which there are eight, as images of Word and Life because of their being as it were between the mutes and vowels and receiving the effluence of the ones above them, and the vapor of the ones below. (8) But regard the vowels, of which in turn there are seven, as images of Man and Church; since it was through Man that <the> voice came forth and gave form to the whole. For the echo of the voice provided a form for them.

6,9 <Thus> there are Word and Life with the eight letters, Man and Church with the seven, and Father and Truth with the nine. (10) But the number that had run away in the Father came down upon the sum that lacked (a number). It was sent to the sum from which it had been parted to remedy the situation, so that the equality of the sums, being uniform,

---

[20] At Gos. Phil. 53,23-54,5 all names for holy things as they are "heard in the world" are said to be "deceptive."

[21] ἐπίσημον, the name of the digamma, or six. See below, especially at 7,1.

[22] Cf. Matt 18:10.

[23] A comparable though unrelated discussion of the letters of the alphabet, including a ranking of their importance, is found at Mars. 25,17-34,19.

would yield one value from all in all cases. (11) And thus the sum of seven acquired the value of eight, and the <three> spaces became correspondent with the numbers, since they were ogdoads. Added in three operations they gave the sum of twenty-four."

6,12 But when the three sounds which Marcus himself says are paired with the three values—that is, of (the) six from which the twenty-four sounds flowed out—are multiplied fourfold by the number of the ineffable tetrad, they yield the same total as those (24 sounds) which Marcus says are the number of the unnameable. (13) They (i.e., the three sounds) are worn by the three values in the likeness of the invisible. Our double letters are images of images of these sounds; and when they are included with the twenty-four sounds (of the alphabet) they give <the> sum of the thirty (Aeons), by the value which is proportionate (to the Aeons' value).

7,1 Marcus says that as the fruit of this computation and this dispensation there has appeared, in the likeness of its image, the One who went up the mountain fourth after the six days and became the sixth, and who came down and was held fast on the seventh—a notable (ἐπίσημον) ogdoad and containing in himself the full total of the sounds. (2) When he came for baptism the descent of the dove, which is omega and alpha, made <him> manifest, for its sum is 801.[24]

7,3 Also for this reason Moses has said that man was created on the sixth day. The dispensation <of the passion> also <took place> on the sixth day; for <on the sixth day>, the day of <the> preparation, the last man appeared for the restoration of the first.[25] The sixth hour, at which he was nailed to the tree, is also the beginning and end of this dispensation.[26] (4) For because the perfect Mind, knowing the number six with its power of creation and regeneration, is showing the sons of light its restoration to itself by itself through the appearance of the episemon. This, he says, is why the double letters have the episemon as their total. For combined with the twenty-four sounds, the episemon has completed the thirty-letter name.

7,5 "As its minister this number has employed the quantity of seven,"[27] so says Marcus' Silence, "so that the fruit of its self-willed will may be made manifest. But for the present," she says, "understand this total of six as the one who is formed on the model of the episemon, was as it were divided

---

[24] Cf. PsT 5.1-2; Fil. 42.2.

[25] I.e., "last man" (= episemon, six) plus "last," plus "first" = ogdoad, eight.

[26] Six plus "beginning" plus "end" = eight.

[27] This is intended to account for the seven heavens or planets, which do not fit Marcus' scheme of sixes and eights. See immediately below.

or cut in two, and remained outside[28]—who, through an emanation from himself, has by his own power and wisdom quickened this world of the seven values[29] which is patterned after the value of the hebdomad, and who has been designated the soul of the visible universe.

7,6 "For his part he does this work as a work performed by his own choice; but since they (i.e., the seven vowel sounds) serve the Mother's Purpose,[30] they are imitations of the inimitable. (7)[31] And the first heaven utters the alpha, the next, the epsilon, the third, <the> eta. The fourth and midmost of the seven, pronounces the value of the iota, the fifth, the omicron, the sixth, the ypsilon. But the seventh, and fourth from the middle, cries out the sound, omega," as Marcus' Silence affirms, who talks all sorts of nonsense but says nothing that is true. (8) "These values," she says, "all ring out together in unison and glorify him by whom they were emitted; and the glory of the sound is sent to First Progenitor. But the echo of this praise drifts earthward," she says, "to become that which forms and generates the things on earth."

7,9 She gives her proof of this from the new-born babes, whose soul, as they issue from the womb, cries out the echo of each of these sounds. Thus, as the seven values glorify the Word, so the soul in infants glorifies him by weeping and wailing <like> Marcus. (10) David, also, has said, "Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings hast thou perfected praise,"[32] on this account, and again, "The heavens declare the glory of God."[33] And thus, when a soul is in trouble and misfortune, to purge itself it cries, "Oh!" as a sign of praise, so that the soul on high will recognize its kinship with it and send it aid.

8,1 And these were the foolish things he said about this whole name which is made of thirty letters, and about Depth, who grew from its letters. And further, about the body of Truth <with> its twelve members <each> composed of two letters, and her voice with which <she conversed without> conversing; and the explanation of the name that was not spoken—and the soul of the world and man, insofar as they have been constituted in an image. (2) But next, beloved, I shall tell you how Tetrad produced an equal numerical value for him from the names (of the Aeons) so that, as

---

[28] The allusion is to the form of the uncial digamma (episemon).
[29] δυνάμεων, "powers."
[30] Ἐνθύμησις.
[31] With the content of 7,7-8 cf. thse vowels of the Name of God as given at Herm. Disc. 61,8-15.
[32] Ps 8:5
[33] Ps 18:2

you have often asked me, you will not be unacquainted with any of his teachings which I happen to know.

8,3 Here, then, is what their all-wise Silence has to say about the origin of the twenty-four sounds. With Soleness there co-exists Oneness. Two emanations from these, Unit and One as we have said, were two times two and made four; for two times two are four. (4) And again, when the two and the four were added they displayed the number six; but these six, multiplied by four, brought forth the twenty-four forms.

8,5 And the names of the first tetrad, which are understood to be holiest of the holy and not utterable, can be known by the Son alone—what they are, the Father knows. But the ones which are pronounced, reverently and with faith, before him, are these: Arretos and Sige, Pater and Aletheia.

8,6 The full total of this tetrad is twenty-four sounds. For the name, Arretos, has seven letters, Seige has five, Pater five, and Aletheia seven. Added together, the twice five and the twice seven, these gave the same number of sounds. (8) And the Savior's spoken name, Jesous, is of six letters, but his unutterable name of twenty-four. "Uios Chreistos" is of twelve letters, but the ineffable name in Christ is of thirty. And she calls him alpha and omega for this reason, to make mention of the dove, since this is "dove's" numerical value.

9,1 But Jesus has the following ineffable origin, she says. From the Mother of all, the first tetrad, the second tetrad[34] came forth in the role of daughter and became an ogdoad, out of which a decad came forth. Now there were a decad and an ogdoad. (2) Joining the ogdoad once more and multiplying it by ten,[35] the decad produced the next number, eighty. Multiplying the eighty by ten again it generated the number 800, so that the sum total of the letters which issue from eight times ten is an eight, an eighty, and an 800, which is "Jesus." (3) For counted by the sum which is found in its letters, the word, "Jesus," is 888. You are now clear as to Jesus' origin beyond the heavens, as they explain it. (4) And this is why the Greek alphabet contains eight units, eight tens, and eight hundreds, giving the figure of 888—in other words, Jesus, who is composed of all the numbers. He is thus called "alpha and omega" to indicate his origin from all.

9,5 And again: When the first tetrad was added to itself cumulatively the number ten was produced; for when one, two, three and four are added they make ten, or iota, and they hold that this is Jesus. (6) But "Chreistos"

---

[34] For the second tetrad see Val. Exp. 29,25-28; 35-38.

[35] There is a comparable, though not identical multiplication at Val. Exp. 30,30-38.

too, she says, which has eight letters, means the first ogdoad which, in the iota's embrace, brought forth Jesus. (7) He is also called "Uios Chreistos," that is, the dodecad. For the name, Uios, has four letters, while Chreistos has eight; added together these gave the amount of twelve.

9,8 Before the six-letter mark of this name—that is, "Jesus," the Son—appeared, men were in profound ignorance and error. (9) But when the six-letter name was made manifest, which was clothed with flesh to be perceptible to man and contained the six itself and the twenty-four, men learned <it>, ceased from their ignorance and ascended from death to life, for the name became their way to the Father of truth. (10) For the Father of all has willed to dissolve ignorance and abolish death. And the dissolution of ignorance was the recognition of him. Thus the Man was chosen who, by his will, was constituted in the image of the value on high.

10,1 For the Aeons issued from <the second> tetrad. In the tetrad there were Man and Church, Word and Life. Thus powers (= "values") which overflowed from these, he says, brought into being the Jesus who appeared on earth. (2) The angel Gabriel took the part of Word, the Holy Spirit, of Life, and the power of the highest, of Man, while the Virgin played the role of Church. (3) And thus Marcus' "man fashioned by dispensation" was brought into being through Mary; and when he had issued from the womb the Father of all chose him, through Word, to come to the knowledge of him. (4) And when he came to the water, the number which had withdrawn to heaven and become the twelfth descended on him as a dove. In this was the seed of these people, who were sown together with it, and have descended and ascended with it.

10,5 He says that the value itself which descended was the Father's seed, and contained both Father and Son, the ineffable value of Silence which is known through them, and all the Aeons. (6) And this is the Spirit which spoke through Jesus' mouth, which confessed itself Son of Man and made the Father known, <and of course> was united with Jesus in descending upon him. And he says that <Jesus>, the Savior produced by the dispensation, abolished death; but that <Christ> made the Father manifest. (7) He says, then, that <"Jesus"> was the name of the man framed by the dispensation, and that his office was to provide a likeness and form for Man, who was to descend upon him. In containing him Jesus possessed Man himself, Word himself, Father and Ineffable, and Silence and Truth, and Church and Life.

11,1 These things are already beyond "Alas and alack!" and every outcry and lamentation in tragedy. For who can fail to detest the author of such big lies, <badly put together>, when he sees the truth made into

an idol by Marcus, and scribbled on with the letters of the alphabet? (2) The Greeks admit that, compared with anything primordial, it was recently—yesterday and the day before, as we say—that they first received sixteen letters from Cadmus. Then later, as time went on, they themselves invented the aspirates at one point and the double consonants at another, and they say that last of all Palamedes added the long vowels to these. (3) Before these things were done among the Greeks then, there was no Truth! For what you call her body, Marcus, is of later origin than Cadmus and his predecessors, later than those who added the rest of the sounds—later even than yourself! For only you have brought down your so-called Truth, <like> an idol.

11,4 But who can put up with your Silence who talks so much nonsense, who names the unnameable, explains the ineffable, searches the unsearchable, and says that he whom you call bodiless and without form has opened his mouth and uttered a Word—like a beast, made up of parts! (5) And his Word, which is like the one who emitted it and which has become a form of the invisible, is composed of thirty sounds, but four syllables. So the Father of all, as you call him, will be composed of thirty sounds but four syllables, in the likeness of Word!

11,6 Or again, who can stand your confinement of the Word of God, the creator, artificer and maker of all, to shapes and numbers—thirty sometimes, sometimes twenty-four, sometimes just six—<and> your dissection of him into four syllables, but thirty sounds? (7) And your reduction of the Lord of all, who established the heavens, to 888, like the alphabet; your subdivision even of the Father himself, who contains all things and yet is uncontained, into a tetrad, an ogdoad, a decad and a dodecad; and your explanation of the ineffability and inconceivability, as you say, of the Father by multiplications like these? (8) You make the essence and subsistence of the One you call incorporeal and without essence out of many letters, with new letters generated by others, though you yourself were the false Daedalus and the bad sculptor of the power before the all-highest! (9) And by subdividing the <essence> you say is indivisible into mutes, vowels and voiced consonants, and falsely attributing their voicelessness to the Father of all and his Ennoia, you have thrust all who trust you into the very height of blasphemy and the greatest impiety.

11,10 Thus it was with justice, and appropriately for such insolence as yours, that the divinely-inspired elder and herald of the truth has cried out at you in verse and said,

11,11 Maker of idols, scanner of portents, Mark,
Skilled in in the arts of astrologue and mage,
Through those confirming lessons taught by error:
To those deceived by thee hast thou shown signs
Which thy sire Satan giveth thee to perform
Through the angelic power of Azazel
For that he deemeth thee the harbinger
Of the villainy of the god opposed to God!

11,12 So far the elder beloved of God. But I shall try to go briefly over the rest of their mysteries, lengthy though they are, and bring to light things which have been concealed for a long time. May this make them easy for everyone to refute!

12,1 By combining the origin of their Aeons with the straying and finding of the sheep, these people who reduce everything to numbers try to give a deeper explanation, and claim that all things are made of a unit and a dyad; (2) and by counting from one to four they generate the decad. For one, two, three and four added together gave birth to the sum of the ten Aeons. But then again the dyad, by proceeding from itself to the episemon—as in "two, four, six"—gave the dodecad. (3) And again, when we count in the same way from two to ten the triacontad is arrived at in which there are an ogdoad, a decad and a dodecad.

12,4 They say that since the dodecad has the episemon in its train the episemon is (its) accident (πάθος which also means "passion"). Thus the sheep ran away and got lost when the error was made about the number twelve—since they claim that the defection was from a dodecad. (5) And they discover by divination that one rebellious value was similarly lost from the <decad>, and this is the woman who lost the drachma, and lit a lamp and found it. (6) After this the numbers that were left—nine in the drachma's case, eleven in the case of the sheep—were also united and gave birth to the number ninety-nine. For nine times eleven are ninety-nine. They say that this is why "Amen" yields this total.

12,7 But I do not mind telling you their explanations in another way, so you will despise their fruit in every respect. They hold that the sound, eta, is an ogdoad if we include the episemon, since it stands eighth after alpha. Then again, by reckoning up the totals of the sounds themselves without the six and adding them cumulatively through eta, they exhibit the triacontad. (8) For if <one> enumerates the sounds from alpha through eta, leaving the episemon out and adding cumulatively, he will arrive at the number thirty. (9) The total from alpha through epsilon is fifteen. Then

seven added to this makes twenty-two. But when eta, or eight, is added to this, it has completed the wondrous triacontad. And from this they prove that the Ogdoad is the mother of the thirty Aeons.

12,10 Now since the number thirty is a combination of three numerical values, it was multiplied by three itself and made ninety, for three times thirty are ninety. But the three was also multiplied by itself and generated a nine. And thus, in their view, the Ogdoad gave birth to the ninety-nine. (11) And since the twelfth Aeon (i.e., the letter mu), when it rebelled, deserted the eleven (letters) before it, they say that the form of the (two) letters (found in the letter mu) is parallel to the shape of the lamda—for lamda, or thirty, is the eleventh letter—and that its place in the alphabet reflects the dispensation (mentioned) above.[36] For, omitting the digamma, the sum of the letters themselves from alpha through lamda, added cumulatively with lamda itself included, is ninety-nine.

12,12 But from the very shape of the sound it is plain that lamda, the eleventh letter, came down in search of its like to make up the number of twelve (letters) and was made complete when it found it. (13) For as though it had come in search of its like, and had found it and clasped <it> to itself, lamda filled the place of the twelfth letter—the letter mu is composed of two lamdas. (14) And so they escape the ninety-ninth place by knowledge—that is, they escape Deficiency which is counted on the left hand—and reach the One. When this was added to ninety-nine, it moved them to the right hand.[37]

13,1 As you go through this, beloved, I am well aware that you will roar with laughter <on hearing> the kind of foolishness they think is wise. But people are worthy of mourning when they make this sort of feeble effort to disparage a religion of such dignity, and the amount of the really inexpressible value, and such great dispensations of God, with alpha, beta and numbers. (2) Any, however, who leave the church and put their faith in these old wives' tales, <are> truly self-condemned. These Paul tells us to repudiate after a first and a second admonition. (3) But John, the disciple of the Lord, extended their condemnation further and did not even want them to be greeted by us, "For he that biddeth them godspeed is partaker of their evil deeds."[38] (4) And rightly so, for the Lord says, "It is not lawful to greet the impious."[39] And impious beyond all impiety are these persons

---

[36] I.e., the ogdoad's generation of the ninety-nine.
[37] This interpretation of the Lost Sheep is found at Gos. Tr. 31,35-32,16.
[38] 2 John 11
[39] Isa 48:22

who say that the creator of heaven and earth, the only God almighty above whom there is no other God, has been emitted by a Deficiency, which itself is the product of another Deficiency. As they see it, then, he himself is an emission of a third Deficiency!

13,5 It is truly imperative that we despise and curse this opinion, keep far, <even> very far away from them, and understand that the more they rely on their frauds and delight in them, the more they are animated by the ogdoad of the evil spirits—(6) just as people subject to fits are in worse condition <the> more they laugh, seem to have recovered, and do everything like persons in good health and some things even better. Similarly, the more these people appear to aim high, and exhaust themselves by shooting with a taut string, the more they are of unsound mind.

13,7 When the unclean spirit of folly had gone out, and then found them busy, not with God but with worldly philosophical inquiries, he took with him seven other spirits more wicked than himself. Making their minds conceited—as becomes those who are capable of conceiving of something higher than God—and ready for entire derangement, he inserted the eightfold folly of the evil spirits into them.

14,1 But I want to explain to you besides how they say that the creation itself, which was wrought by the Demiurge in the image of things invisible, was made by the Mother without his knowledge. (2) They say that the four elements, fire, water, earth, and air, were emitted first as an image of the supernal first tetrad and that when their operations are reckoned in with them—that is, heat, cold, dryness and wetness—they are the exact image of the ogdoad.[40]

14,3 <And> next they enumerate ten powers as follows. Seven circular <bodies>, which they also term heavens; then the circle that encloses them, which they also call an eighth heaven; and the sun and moon besides. As these make ten in all, they say they are images of the invisible decad which issued from Word and Life.

14,4 But the dodecad is made known by the so-called circle of the zodiac. For they say that the twelve signs obviously represent the dodecad, the daughter of Man and Church. (5) And since the highest heaven has been counterpoised against the very swift motion of all (the others)—bearing down on their vault itself, and compensating for their speed with its slowness, so that it revolves from sign to sign in thirty years—they say it is an image of Limit, who surrounds their Mother for whom there are

[40] The point seems to be that the Mother is "Ogdoad."

thirty names. (6) And the moon, in turn, which traverses its own heaven in thirty days, portrays the number of the thirty Aeons with the days. (7)[41] The sun too, which makes its revolution in twelve months and follows its circular path back to its starting-point, makes the dodecad visible through the twelve months. But the days also, which are limited to twelve hours, typify the dodecad which <is not> luminous.

14,8 But indeed they say that even the hour, the twelfth part of a day, is composed of thirty parts in the image of the triacontad. (9) And the rim of the zodiacal circle itself is made of 360 parts, for each sign has thirty. And thus they say the image of the union of twelve with thirty is preserved even by the circle. (10) And further, they insist that even the earth is very plainly a type of the dodecad and its children. For they say that it is divided into twelve regions, and in each region, from its position directly below it, it receives <a particular> power from the heavens, and bears offspring in the likeness of the power that is sending its effluent down upon it.

14,11 They say further that when the Demiurge wanted to reproduce the infinity, eternity, boundlessness and timelessness of the Ogdoad on high, he could not portray its stability and eternity because he was a fruit of Deficiency <himself>. So he has sown its eternity in times, seasons, numbers, and long periods of years, with the intention of imitating its endlessness by the great number of the periods of time. (12) And here they say that since Truth deserted him falsehood has followed, and his work will therefore meet with destruction when the times are fulfilled.

15,1 And by saying such things about creation, each of them, so far as he is able, produces <some> further novelty every day. For with them, no one is ripe unless he bears big lies. (2) But I should tell you which prophetic passages they transform, and supply the rebuttal for them.

For they say that when Moses was beginning his work on the creation he displayed the Mother of all at the very outset by saying, "In Beginning God created the heaven and the earth." (3) By naming these four then—God and Beginning, heaven and earth—he portrayed, as they say, their tetrad. And to make its invisibility and hiddenness known he said, "And the earth was invisible and unformed."

15,4 <But> they hold that he has spoken of the second tetrad, the offspring of the first, by naming an abyss, the darkness in themselves, water and the Spirit which was borne above the water. (5) After which, to make

[41] With 14,7-8 cf. the treatment of the divisions of time which is found at Tri. Trac. 73,28-74,2; Eug. 83,20-84,11.

mention of the decad, he said light, day and night; a firmament, evening and what is called early morning; dry land and sea, and further, vegetation; and tenth, trees. And thus he made the ten Aeons known through the ten names.

15,6 And the value of the dodecad is represented in his work as follows. For he says sun and moon; stars and seasons; years and whales and <further>, fish and creeping things, birds and four-legged creatures; wild beasts. And in addition to all these, twelfth, man. They teach that in this way the triacontad has been spoken of by the Spirit through Moses.

15,7 Indeed even the man formed in the image of the value on high has within him the value from the one source—(it is seated in the cranial cavity) from which flow four so-called faculties[42] in the image of the tetrad on high: sight; hearing; the sense of smell, third; fourth, taste. (8) And they say that the ogdoad is made known through the man in the following way. He has two ears, the same number of eyes and further, two nostrils and a dual sense of taste, the taste of bitter and sweet. (9) But they teach that the whole man contains the whole image of the triacontad as follows. He bears the decad on his hands with the fingers, but the dodecad in his entire body, which is divided into twelve members. (They divide it as the body of Truth is divided in their teachings—we have spoken of that.) And the ogdoad then, which is ineffable and invisible, is understood to be concealed in the viscera.

16,1 They claim in turn that the sun, the greater light, was created on the fourth day because of the number of the tetrad. (2) In their teachings the courts of the tabernacle constructed by Moses, which were made of flax, blue, purple, and scarlet, exhibited the same image. (3) They declare that the high priest's robe, which was decorated with four rows of precious stones, indicates the tetrad. And anything <at all> of this sort in the scriptures, which can be reduced to the number four, they say has been put there because of their tetrad.

16,4 But the ogdoad, in turn, is exhibited as follows. They say that man was formed on the eighth day. (For they sometimes hold that he was created on the sixth day and sometimes <on> the eighth, unless they mean that the man of earth was made on the sixth, but the man of flesh on the eighth—for they draw this distinction. (5) And some of them <even> hold that <there was> one man created male and female in God's image

[42] δυνάμεις.

and likeness, and this is the spiritual man; but the man formed from the earth is another one.)

16,6 And they say that the provision of the ark during the flood, in which eight persons were saved, makes the saving ogdoad known very plainly. David too, who was the eighth brother in order of birth, has the same significance. Furthermore even circumcision, which is performed on the eighth day, shows how ogdoad above is cut off from us. (7) And in a word, they say that anything in the scriptures which can be reduced to the number eight is applicable to the mystery of the ogdoad.

16,8 Moreover, they say the decad is indicated by the ten nations God promised to give Abraham for his possession. The provision <concerning> Sarah, that after ten years she gave him her maid Hagar to father children by, has the same meaning. (9) And the servant who was sent by Abraham for Rebecca, and who gave her ten gold bracelets at the well; and her brethren, who kept her for ten days—and further, Rehoboam, who received rule over ten tribes; the ten courts of the tabernacle, and its pillars ten cubits high; Jacob's ten sons, who were sent to Egypt to buy food the first time; and the ten apostles to whom the Lord appeared after the resurrection when Thomas was absent. These, in their opinion, portrayed the invisible decad.

17,1 They also say that the dodecad, on which the mystery of the Deficiency's passion centers—from which passion they hold that the visible things were made—is conspicuously and evidently to be found everywhere in scripture. (2) For example, Jacob's twelve sons, from whom <the> twelve tribes also sprang; the intricate breastplate with its twelve stones; the twelve bells; the twelve stones which were placed at the foot of the mountain by Moses, those too that were set up by Joshua in the river and others on the further bank; the bearers of the ark of the covenant; the stones Elijah set up at the sacrifice of the calf; the number of the apostles.[43] And in a word, they say that everything which preserves the number twelve is a representation of their dodecad.

17,3 It is their contention that they can exhibit the union of all these things, which they call a triacontad, by the thirty-cubit height of Noah's ark; and Samuel, who seated Saul first among his thirty guests; and David, when he was hidden for thirty days in the field, and the thirty who joined him in the cave; and because the length of the holy tabernacle was thirty cubits; and whatever else they find to have the same number as these.

---

[43] Fil. 42.2-3: columbam…quae descendit…ad dodecim aeonas, id est ad duodecim apostolos.

18,1 <But> to these I feel I must also add the passages they cull from scripture in the attempt to argue for their First Progenitor who was unknown to all before Christ's coming; and to prove that our Lord proclaimed a Father other than the maker of our universe (whom, as I said, they impiously call a fruit of a Deficiency). (2) They reinterpret the prophet Isaiah who indeed said, "Israel doth not know me, and the people doth not understand me,"[44] as having spoken of the ignorance of the invisible Depth. (3) They also force what was said by Hosea, "There is no truth nor knowledge of God in them,"[45] to pertain to the same; and they apply the words, "There is none that understandeth, or seeketh after God; they are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable,"[46] to the ignorance of Depth. (4) They also argue that the words said by Moses, "There shall no man see God and live,"[47] refers to him. They tell the further lie that the creator has been seen by the prophets; but they hold that the <scriptural words>, "There shall no man see God and live," were said of the invisible majesty which is unknown to all. (5) (And that "There shall no man see God" is said of the invisible Father and maker of the universe is plain to us all. However, that this does not refer to their further invention, Depth, but to the Creator, and <that> he himself is the invisible God, will be shown in the course of the treatise.)

18,6 They also say that Daniel meant the same when he asked the angel for the interpretations of the parables, as though he did not know them. Moreover to conceal the great mystery of Depth from him the angel told him, "Go thy way, Daniel, for these words are sealed until the understanding understand, and the white be made white."[48] And they boast that they are the "white" and the "understanding."

18,7 In addition to these they produce an unutterably large number of apocryphal, spurious writings which they have forged themselves, to the consternation of the foolish who do not know the true scriptures. (8)[49] For this purpose they also employ the fraudulent story that when the Lord was a child and learning to read and his teacher, as is customary, told him, "Say Alpha," he answered, "Alpha." (9) And when the teacher in turn told him to say "Beta," the Lord replied, "Tell thou me first what is Alpha, and then will I tell thee what is Beta." And they interpret this to

[44] Isa 1:3
[45] Hos 4:1
[46] Rom 3:11-12
[47] Exod 33:20
[48] Dan 12:9-10
[49] With the story told in 18,8-9 cf. Epistula Apostolorum 4 (James p. 486); Infancy Story of Thomas A 6.3 (H-S I p. 445).

mean that the Lord alone understood the unknowable, and revealed it in the form of the Alpha.

18,10 They also adapt some of the Gospel passages to this type of thing. For example, the Lord's answer to his mother when he was twelve, "Wist ye not that I must be in my Father's house?"[50] they say, proclaimed the Father they did not know to them. And this is why he sent the disciples out to the twelve tribes, preaching the God who was unknown to them. (11) And to the person who addressed him as "Good Master," he confessed the truly good God by saying, "Why callest thou me good? One is good, the Father in the heavens";[51] and they say that "heavens" in this case means "Aeons."

18,12 And they explain that he has shown the Father's ineffability by <not> speaking, because he gave no answer to those who asked him, "By what authority doest thou these things?"[52] and they were baffled by his counter-question instead. (13) Moreover, when he said, "Oft have I desired to hear one of these words, and have found none to say it," they say that the "word" was the word of a person who, by saying "one," would evidence the truly one God whom they had not known. (14) Further, by contemplating Jerusalem, weeping for it, and saying, "If thou hadst known, even thou this day, the things that belong unto peace—but they are hid <from> thee,"[53] with the word, "hid," he has indicated Depth's hiddenness. (15) Again, by saying, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and learn of me,"[54] he has proclaimed the Father of Truth. For what they did not know, they say, he promised to teach them .

18,16 <As proof> of all this and a kind of cap to their argument they cite, "I thank thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hidden them from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them unto babes. Ah, my Father, for it was good in thy sight. All things are delivered unto me of my Father; and no man knoweth the Father save the Son, and the Son, save the Father, and he to whomsoever the Son shall reveal him."[55] (17) <For> they say that with this the Lord has expressly shown that before his coming no one ever knew their falsely invented Father of truth. And they want to make it out that, since the maker and creator was always

[50] Luke 2:9
[51] Mark 10:17-18
[52] Matt 21:23-27 par.
[53] Luke 19:42
[54] Matt 11:28-29
[55] Matt 11:25-27

known by everyone, the Lord has said this too of the the Father whom no one knows, the one they proclaim.

19,1 Their conferral of "redemption"[56] is characteristically invisible and impossible to grasp, stemming as it does from the untouchable, invisible Mother and therefore, because of its instability, cannot be simply summarized—since they each hand it down as they choose. For there are as many "redemptions" as there are mystagogues of this persuasion. (2) When I refute them I shall declare at the proper place that this type of thing has been fobbed off by Satan, as a denial of the baptism of regeneration to God, and for the abolition of all of the faith.

19,3 They say that redemption is a necessity for those who have received the perfect knowledge, so that they may be reborn to the power above all. <It is> impossible to enter the Pleroma otherwise, for in their view this is what transports them to the bottom of Depth. (4) They suppose that the baptism of the visible Jesus <is> for the remission of sins, but the redemption of the Christ who came down into him is for perfection, and that the one is soulish, but the other is spiritual. Baptism has been proclaimed by John for repentance, but redemption has been obtained by Christ for perfection.[57] (5) And it is of this that he says, "And I have another baptism to be baptized with, and am in great haste for it."[58] Moreover, they say that the Lord added this redemption to the sons of Zebedee when their mother asked that they sit in the kingdom with him on his right and left, by saying, "Can ye be baptized with the baptism that I am to be baptized with?"[59] (6) And they claim that Paul has often made express mention of the redemption in Christ Jesus, and that this is the "redemption" which they hand down in complex, inconsistent ways.

20,1 For some of them get a bridal chamber ready,[60] conduct the initiation of their candidates with certain invocations, and claim that the rite they are performing is a spiritual marriage in the likeness of the syzygies on high. (2) But some take them to water, and use the following invocation as they baptize them: "In the name of the unknowable Father of all; of Truth, Mother of all; and of him who descended upon Jesus for union, redemption, and participation in the powers." (3) Others pronounce an

---

[56] At Tri. Trac. 127,25-128,4 baptism is said to be "redemption." See n. 61.
[57] A comparable distinction seems to be implied at On Bapt. A 41,10-38.
[58] Cf. Luke 12:50.
[59] Mark 10:38
[60] See p. 232 n. 4. At Tri. Trac.128,33-35 baptism is referred to as the bridal chamber, and this is often the meaning in Gos. Phil. At Gos. Phil. 69,1-70,3 it might mean the eucharist. On the subject see Schenke, *Das Philippusevangelium*.

invocation with Hebrew names to terrify the candidates the more, as follows: "Basema chamosse baainaoora mistadia rouada, kousta babophor kalachthei." This means something like "More than every power of the Father I call on <thee, who art> termed light, good spirit, and life, for in a body thou didst reign."

20,4 But when others <conduct> the redemption in their turn they pronouce this invocation: "The name hidden from every Godhead, sovereignty and truth, the name which Jesus of Nazareth put on in the girdles of the light of Christ—the Christ who lives by Holy Spirit—for angelic redemption, the name of the restoration: (5) Messia oupharegna mempsai men chal daian mosome daea akhphar nepseu oua Jesou Nazaria." The translation of this is something like, "I do not distinguish the spirit, the heart, and the merciful power above the heavens. May I enjoy the benefit of thy name, O true Savior!" (6) And the officiants themselves pronounce this invocation but the neophyte responds, "I have been stablished and redeemed, and do redeem my soul from this world and all that is of this world in the name of Iao, who redeemed his soul for redemption in the living Christ." (7) Then the congregation add, "Peace be to all on whom this name doth abide!" Then they anoint the candidate with oil[61] of balsam; for they say that this ointment is a type of the sweet savor which is above all.

20,8 Some of them claim that it is unnecessary to bring candidates to the water, but mix oil and water and apply them to the candidates' heads with <certain> invocations like the ones we have given, and hold that this is redemption. But they too anoint with oil of balsam.

20,9 Others reject all this and claim that the mystery of the ineffable, invisible power must not be conducted with visible, perishable creatures, and that of the inconceivable and incorporeal with the perceptible and bodily. (10) The discernment of the ineffable Majesty is perfect redemption in itself.[62] The whole system of ignorance which was brought about by Deficiency's ignorance and passion is dissolved by knowledge, so that knowledge is the redemption of the inner man. (11) And redemption is neither corporeal—for the body is mortal—nor soulish, since the soul too

[61] Together with baptism, chrismation is important in Gos. Phil. See 57,21-28; 67,2-9; 24-30; 69,9-14; 73,16-19 74,12-18. And cf. Acts of Thomas 27 (H-S II p. 456); 121 (p. 507); 157 (p. 526).

[62] At Apoc. Ad. 85,19-31 "hidden knowledge" is said to be holy baptism; at Test. Tr. 69,15-31 baptism is renunciation of the world. Baptism appears to be deprecated at Gos. Jud. 55,21-56,1.

<comes> from Deficiency and is a sort of dwelling-place for the spirit; redemption too, then, must be spiritual. (12) For the inner, spiritual man is redeemed through knowledge, and they are content with the discernment of all things, and this is true redemption.

This concludes the excerpt from Irenaeus

21,1 The blessed elder Irenaeus composed this whole searching inquiry, and gave every detail of all their false teaching in order. Hence, as I have already indicated, I am content with his diligent work and have presented it all word for word, as it stands in his writings. (2) They will be refuted by the very things the holy man has said in opposition to their wickedness. For we believe, as the truth everywhere makes apparent, as sound reasoning indicates and as is in agreement with the standard of piety, the Law and prophets, the ancient patriarchs in succession, in accordance with the Savior's own teaching—(3) for <the Lord> and his apostles plainly teach us to confess one God as Father, the almighty sovereign of all, and our Lord Jesus Christ and his Holy Spirit, one holy Trinity uncreate; while all other things were created out of nothing, subsequent to the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. (4) Now since these things are confessed plainly and believed, by these holy prophets, evangelists, and apostles, no shifty device can withstand the truth's bright beam, as I have often said at length in opposition to every sect. (5) It is thus perfectly plain that, precisely like the other sects, this murderous tramp is tailoring and devising these big things in order to show off and make a nuisance of himself.

22,1 But passing his wickedness by as well, and the wickedness of the people who are called Marcosians after him, let us hurry on to the rest, beloved, and in turn discover their roots and counteract the bitterness of their fruit by making public the refutation of it and all of the facts about them—(2) not for the harm of the readers but for their protection, so that they will not go near any of the sects before or after this one, but read what they have written, become acquainted with their cant and despise it, and flee from its viperous wickedness and, as I said, not go near it.

22,3 The naturalists speak of a viper called the dipsas, which does the following sort of harm. In certain places where there are depressions in the rocks, or little basins hollowed out of rocks as a receptacle, the dipsas finds water, drinks and, after drinking puts its poison into these pools of water. Then any animal that approaches and drinks its fill will feel refreshed because it drank, but it will fall right down and die from the viper's venom, beside the receptacle which has received it. (4) Moreover, if the dipsas strikes

someone, his pain from its extremely hot poison will make him thirsty and want a drink, and impel him to keep coming up and drinking. (5) Each time the victim <feels> such deadly pain and <has some water> he will think that it does his injury some good but later, with his stomach filled by that very drink and unable to hold <any> more, he will vomit his life out along with the drink. (6) Thus Marcus too causes the death of his dupes with a drink. But since we have been rescued from this poison by the power of God, let us go on to the rest.

35.
Against Colorbasians.[1] *Number 15, but 35 of the series*

1,1 Colorbasus comes next after these. He drew on Marcus' sorcery, but also grew up like thorns from the root of Ptolemy. In his turn he invented irritants for the world, like goads, other than theirs, by working up a supposedly greater "experience" as though he had come down from heaven. (2) He was originally a partner of Marcus[2] whose ideas were the same as his, their sect being like a two-headed snake. But later, like a head cut off a snake's body and still breathing, he did fatal harm to many by showing them something supposedly greater and more authentic than his contemporaries and predecessors had.

1,3[3] "For he says that the first ogdoad has not been emitted in a descending series, one Aeon by another. As though he had been their midwife himself he maintains that the emanation of the six Aeons has been brought forth, at the same time and once for all, by First Progenitor and his Ennoia. And he and his followers no longer say like the others that Man and Church have been brought forth by Word and Life, but that Word and Life have been brought forth by Man and Church. (4) They also say the following in a different way: When First Progenitor had conceived of emitting something, this was called Father. But since what he emitted was a truth, this was termed Truth. When he willed to show himself, this was

---

[1] Epiph draws his account of the teaching he ascribes to Colorbasus from Iren. 1.12.3-4. PsT 5.1-3 gives what was presumably Hipp. Synt.'s account of Marcus and Colorbasus, treated together. Fil. 42 treats Colorbasus separately, and appears to combine Hipp. Synt. with some garbled Irenaean material, perhaps from Pan. 31,14-6-9.

[2] Knowing from Hipp. Synt. that Colorbasus and Marcus were associates (see PsT 5.1; Hipp. Refut. 6.55.3). Epiph assumes that Colorbasus must be one of the unnamed teachers who, at Iren. 1.12.3, are called qui…putantur prudentiores illorum, and that Marcus' connection with them is confirmed by Iren. 1.13.1.

[3] 1.3-7 is quoted from Iren. 1.12.3-4. Cf. Tert. Adv. Val. 36; 39.

called Man. But the Aeons of which he had previously thought when he emitted them—this was termed Church. Man, also, <sends forth>Word; he is the first-born son. But Life also accompanies Word. And thus a first ogdoad was brought to completion.

1,5[4] "There is also considerable dispute among them about the Savior. Some say he is the product of all and is therefore called 'Well- Pleased," since all of the Pleroma was pleased to glorify the Father through him.[5] Some say he is the product only of the ten Aeons which were emitted by Word and Life <and is called 'Word' and 'Life' accordingly>, preserving the names of his forebears. (6) Others say he is the product of the twelve Aeons produced by Man and Church, and thus, as Man's progeny, confesses <himself> the 'Son of Man.' Others say he originates from Christ and Holy Spirit, <the ones emitted> in order to make the Pleroma firm. He is called "Christ' for this reason, preserving the title of the Father by whom he was emitted. (7) But others, certain bards of theirs as we might call them, say that the First Progenitor of the universe, its First Principle and the First One of whom there can be no conception, is called Man.[6] And this is the great, secret mystery—the power which is above all and encompasses all is called Man! And this is why the Savior says he is Son of Man!"[7]

2,1 Here, too, is Colorbasus' bombastic nonsense—of no use to the world and a figment of his imagination. If one examines it closely he will see from what lies before him that <the cause> of each of these people's opinions is his ambition. (2) From vainglory and their desire to gather a following each of them told any lies that came into his head, not by speaking prophetically—the Holy Spirit did not speak in them—or by taking even one cue from the truth of the prophets and Gospels.

2,3 But the rebuttal of all these people's falsely styled "knowledge" is the same assertion of the truth which has been made against the previous ones. Because they all belong to the school of Valentinus and his

---

[4] With what follows cf. the various names which are given to the Son at Tri. Trac. 87,1-17.

[5] Cf. "The Son in whom the Totalities are pleased," Tri. Trac. 87,1.

[6] The Father of the All is called both "man" and "first man" at Apocry. Jn. CG II,1 14,13-24; at BG 8502,2 47,14-49,9 "the holy perfect Father" is called "man," "first man" and "perfect man." At Gr. Seth 52,30-53,5 the Father of Truth is the "Man of the Greatness." Jeu is "the great Man" at 2 Jeu 50 (MacDermot p. 122) and frequently in Pistis Sophia.

At Eug. 85,9-13, God's first emanation is "man": "The first aeon, then, is that of Immortal Man. The second aeon is that of the Son of Man, who is called 'First Begetter.'" and see SJC 108,1-10; 103,21-105,2. The first emanation is also "man" at Pan. 31,5,5, the Valentinian document. For an extensive discussion of this subject see Schenke, *Der Gott, 'Mensch.'*

[7] Gos. Egyp. III,2 54,1-4: Then came a voice from the height, "the Man exists and the Son of Man!" See also Gos. Egyp. 49,9-10 and 49,16-25.

predecessors and each (simply) interprets his intent differently, they will all incur the same discomfiture.

2,4 For this Colorbasus too has come to bring us a great, absurd deceit. He has made up a name for us, "Man," and given it to the incomprehensible, invisible, holy God, the Father of all. This to combine with his own imposture the saying in which the Savior calls himself Son of Man, and to divert the minds of those who make use of it from Christ's trustworthy and perfectly clear confession about himself to an impossibility, and to the nonsense <of their inquiries about a non-existent ogdoad, as though it existed in the heavens>.

2,5 For suppose we grant that, as this pathetic Colorbasus says, Christ called himself Son of Man because some Father on high of his is named "Man," and not because of the flesh he took from a virgin womb, that is from St. Mary, when he was conceived by the Holy Spirit. (6) What would he say about the thing the same Jesus Christ our Lord said when he told the Jews, "But now ye seek to kill me, a man that has told you the truth, which I heard of my Father?"[8] (7) And here he did not say, "the man, my Father" but, to confess the Father, indicated that he is God of all; but of himself, because he had truly become man, he said that he was man. (8) The apostles too—so that the truth may be established in every way and the origin of the names which are ascribed to the Lord may be known—say, "Jesus, a man approved among you by signs and wonders,"[9] and so on.

2,9 What can you say to this, you most pathetic of all people—since you have come from on high bringing us new names, and you take pride in having dared to attach the name, "Man," to the Lord of all and Father of all himself, as though the Lord is called Son of Man because Man is his Father's name? (10) Find us some other term to fit the Father, <corresponding with> "man approved!" But you never could! Even though "man" also means "male," and we call a male a "man" to distinguish him from a woman, you can still make nothing out of this either. (11) No one can be termed male without certain features and members, hidden and visible. We call a woman "man" too, but not "male"; thus we say both ὁ ἄνθρωπος and ἡ ἄνθρωπος. (12) But when we distinguish sex we call the feminine specifically "woman," but the masculine "male," for this is the distinction between the masculine and feminine sex, the words "male" and "woman." But both the male and the woman are called "man" synonymously.

3,1 Since this is the case, join me, all you servants of God and lovers of the truth, and laugh at the fraud and tramp Colorbasus! Or rather, mourn

[8] John 8:40
[9] Acts 2:22

for those who have been deceived, and have destroyed themselves and many others. (2) But let us ourselves thank God that the truth guides its sons in a straight path with short, simple words, and that it disperses, overturns, and gets rid of things that are jarring and loud, though dressed up with much ingenuity. The truth goes softly, as is plain to see from the prophet's oracle. (3) In accusation of those who waste their energy on cleverness, and invent long-winded verbiage to their own deception, the prophet said, "Forasmuch as ye refuse the water of Siloam that goeth softly, the Lord bringeth up upon you the water of the river, the king of the Assyrians."[10] (4) For "water of Siloam" means the "teaching of Him who has been sent." And who can this be but our Lord Jesus Christ, who has been sent from God, his Father? And <he "goes> softly" because <he introduces> no nonsense or fiction, but in truth introduces his holy bride, whom he calls "dove" in the Songs of Solomon because of the dove's harmlessness, gentleness and very great purity.

3,5 And it is surprising that he called the other women, who are not his but have taken his name, "concubines" and "queens" because of the royal name of which each one boasts by having "Christ" inscribed on her. (6) But even though there are eighty concubines—meaning the sects—and then young women without number, he says, "One is my dove, my perfect one"; that is, the holy bride and catholic church herself. "Dove," as I said, because of the dove's gentleness, harmlessness and purity; and "perfect" because she has received perfect grace from God, and perfect knowledge from the Savior himself, through the Holy Spirit.

3,7 The bridegroom himself, then, whose name means "sent," or "Siloam," has water that flows softly—that is, teaching which is quiet and makes no commotion, and is not imaginary and not boastful. (8) And his bride too is a peaceable dove, with no poison, huge teeth or stings—like all these people with their snake-like forms and gush of venom, each doing his best to prepare some poison for the world and do harm to his converts.

3,9 This man is one of them as well. I have hastened to detect him here with divinely-given speech and aid from above, and squash him like the snake with four jaws which is called the malmignatte—or crush him at once like a head cut off from the two-headed viper, the amphisbaena. (10) But I shall pass him by, and once more investigate the rest, and ask in prayer that I may describe them truthfully as I go over them, but harm no one and not be harmed myself.

[10] Isa. 8:6-7

36.

Against Heracleonites.[1] *Number sixteen, but thirty-six of the series*

1,1 One Heracleon, the founder of the so-called Heracleonites, is Colorbasus' successor; he is no less versed in the <foolery> of their nonsense. (2) Whatever they say, he declares too; naturally, since he began as one of them and copied his poison from them. But he wants to surpass them by supposedly devising something further, on his own account, for the sake of gathering his own body of dupes.

1,3 For by forming themselves into the imitation of a body with 100 heads or 100 hands, all these people have mimicked the Cottus or Briareus—also called Aegaeon or Gyes—of the Greek poets' mythology, or the so-called "many-eyed Argus." (4) As the poets told fantastic stories about them in their recitations, saying fabulously that one had 100 hands and sometimes fifty or sometimes 100 heads, and another had 100 eyes—and they say that this is why Hermes is called "Argeïphontes," because he killed Argus with his many eyes—(5) each of these people has named himself a head to establish his own supremacy, slipping in other things besides the wasted effort and insane doctrine of his teachers. But not to go on too long with the composition of the preface, I shall come to the matter in hand.

2,1[2] Heracleon—and the Heracleonites who, as said, derive from him—like Marcus and certain of his predecessors makes allegations about the Ogdoads, I mean the upper and the lower. Then, too, he takes the same view of the syzygies of the thirty Aeons. (2) He too alleges that the Father of all on high, whom he also called "Depth," is a man. He too wants to say that the Father is neither male nor female, but that the Mother of all, whom he calls both Silence and Truth, is derived from him. (3) And derived from her is the second Mother, the one who had the lapse of memory, whom he too calls Achamoth. From her all things were brought into being defectively.

---

[1] For reasons which are unclear, Epiph takes as his source for Sect 36 the last part of Irenaeus' account of the Marcosians, Iren. 1.21.3-5, where the sacramental practices of the Marcosians (Valentinians?) are described.

Heracleon is mentioned at Iren. 2.4.1 and said to be in agreement with Valentinus as to the aeons. PsT 4.8, presumably following Hipp. Synt. says of Heracleon: Introducit enim in primis illud fuisse quod <deum> pronuntiat, et deinde ex illa monada duo, ac deinde reliquos Aeonas. Cf. Fil. 41.

Hipp. Refut. 6.35.6 places Heracleon with Ptolemy in the "Italian school" of Valentinians, who maintain that Jesus' body is ψύχικον. Tert. Adv. Val. 4.2, where there may be some independent information about Valentinians, names Heracleon as an innovator.

[2] 2,1-3 might be Epiph's own conjecture, based on Iren. 2.4.1.

2,4 But he too intends to say more than his predecessors, and it is this. He "redeems" those of their people who are dying and have reached the actual point of death,[3] taking his cue from Marcus, but no longer doing it in Marcus' way—for his part handling it differently by redeeming his dupes at the point of death, if you please. (5) "For sometimes some of them will mix oil with water,[4] and apply it to the head of the dying; others apply the ointment known as balsam, and water." But they have in common the invocation as Marcus before him composed it, with the addition of certain names. And the invocation is this: (6) "Messia oupharegna mempsai men chal daian mosome daea akhphar nepseu oua jesou Nazaria."[5]

2,7 And they do this in order that those who receive these invocations at the point of death, with the water and the oil or ointment mixed with it, will supposedly "become untouchable by the principalities and authorities on high and invisible to them, allowing their inner man to pass them unseen—(8) with their bodies left behind in the created world, while their souls are committed to the Demiurge"[6] on high who originated in Deficiency, and so stay there with him. But as I said their "inner man,"[7] <which is> deeper down inside them than soul and body, ascends beyond him. This, they hold, has descended from the Pleroma on high.

3,1 To the persons of whom they make fools in this way they give the direction,[8] "If you come upon the principalities" and authorities, remember to say this "after your <departure>, (2) 'I am a son of a Father, a Father who was before me;[9] and here and now I am a son. <And> I have come to see all that is mine and all that belongs to others—yet it by no means belongs to others but to Achamoth, who is female and made these things for herself. I derive from the One who was before her and am returning to my own, whence I came.'[10] (3) And so saying he escapes the authorities

---

[3] Iren. 1.21.5. Mandaeans also use water in their rite of extreme unction, see Drowyer pp. 64-68.

[4] Iren. 1.21.4

[5] Irenaeus gives this invocation at l.21.3 in this account of the Marcosians. F. Gaffin is cited in Rousseau and Doutreleaux, *Sources Chrétiennes* 263, p.270f, as reconstructing a Syriac or Aramaic original whose translation is, "I am anointed and redeemed from myself and from every judgment by the name of Yahweh; redeem me, O Jesus of Nazareth." See Amidon p. 128.

[6] This is quoted from Iren. 1.21.5.

[7] For "inner man" see Let. Pet. 137,21-22; PS passim, Man. Ps. 173,19-20.

[8] This speech, and the one that follows it, is quoted from Iren. 1.21.5. There are longer versions of it at 1 Apoc. Jas. 33,13-34,18 and Cod. Tch. James 19,24-22,23, and a comparable one at Nat. Arc. 92,21-27.

[9] Or: the preexisting Father (Amidon).

[10] For returning to one's own, or the like, see Apocry. Jas 1,23-24; 14,19-21; Gos. Tr.

but encounters the company of the Demiurge" on high, in the vicinity of the first ogdoad. (They too hold that there is a hebdomad below, after the Demiurge. He is in the seventh <heaven> as an eighth, but defectively and ignorantly.)

3,4[11] "And to the company of the Demiurge" the departed "says, 'I am a vessel more precious than the female who made you. If your Mother is ignorant of her own root, I know myself and realize whence I am,[12] and call upon the imperishable Wisdom who is in the Father, but who is the Mother of your Mother who has no father or even male consort. (5) A female born of a female made you[13] because she did not know even her mother and believed herself to be alone.[14] I, however, call upon her Mother.' (6) On hearing this the company of the Demiurge are most disturbed, and condemn their root and the Mother's stock; but the departed goes to his own casting off his chain[15] and 'angel,' that is, <the> soul," (for they think there is something else in a man, after body and soul). "And this is what I have been able to learn about redemption."

4,1[16] But after listening to the extravagant nonsense of their mime the wise must laugh at the way each one lays down a law different from the other's to suit himself and is not restrained from his own impudence but invents as much as he can. (2) "<And> it is difficult to discover or state all the <doctrines> of the people who" are being spawned and sprouting up among them "even to this day, and every day find something new to say" and delude their converts. So again I shall rest content with what has been said about this sect, for I have given the information I myself have gathered about it.

4,3 Who can fail to see that teaching like theirs is entirely myth and nonsense? Where did you get your body, Mister—you, or your predecessors? Where did you get your soul? Your inmost man? (4) Even if it was from

---

21,11-25; 22,18-20; 34,14-16; Tri. Trac. 117,17-25; 123,4-8; GT 49; 50; Or. Wld. 127,14-15; 1 Apoc. Jas. 35,21-23; Cod. Tch. James 21,15-19; Apoc. Paul 23,9-10; PS 3.112 (MacDermot p. 289).

[11] See p. 104 n. 72.

[12] For this very common Gnostic motif see Apocry. Jas. 12,20-22; Tri. Trac. 60,23-24; GT 3; 111; Gos. Phil. 76,18-22; Thom. Cont. 138,7-20; Dia. Sav. 132,15-16; 134,19-22; Corp. Herm. 1.19.

[13] The reference is to Achamoth, see n. 112 p. 186. Cf. Auth. Teach. 23,22-26, "And yet they are outsiders, without power to inherit from the male, but they will inherit from their mother only." Gos. Phil. 52,21-24 says that "Hebrews" have only a mother, while "Christians" have father and mother.

[14] See n. 11 p. 87.

[15] Cf. The "bondage of the body" at Para. Shem 35,16-17, and see Corp. Herm. I.26.

[16] 4,1-2 is paraphrased from Iren. 1.21.5.

above, from the spirituality on high—as you dramatically say to ensnare your dupes with a promise of hope, so that they may be excited by some goal and thus bewitched by your performance[17]—(even so) tell me, what does the spirituality on high have in common with the material? What does the material have in common with the soulish?

4,5 How could the Demiurge create things that did not belong to him? Why did the <spiritual one> on high hand his spiritual power over to the Demiurge who had not done good work? And why did the Demiurge prefer to mix his own soulish nature with the material and bind his own power fast with matter? (6) But if he does want to mix his own power in with it, matter is not alien to him. And if indeed it is alien, who gave him authority over matter? (7) And first, you fraud, tell me whether he bound the soul with matter because he hated it or because he did not know what would happen. But I know you won't say either!

4,8 For I deny that the body is "matter"—anything but!—or that God's creatures are. However, scripture does know another kind of "matter," in addition to this common matter which is available for their works to every craft and trade. I mean the sordid reflection arising from the reason, and <the> filthy thoughts of sin. (9) For noisome, filthy <thoughts> arise <from an evil heart> like a bad smell and unclean effluent from mud, as the blessed David said when he was persecuted and slandered by wicked men, "I was trapped in matter of an abyss,"[18] and so on.

5,1 But since you suppose that this is called "matter," Heracleon—human bodies and the entire world here—for what purpose did the Demiurge get his own soul mixed up with matter? (2) If it was because he did not know evil—a person who does not know what he intends to make, cannot make it. Neither do we accomplish anything in any craft by making something we do not understand. We both reflect beforehand on the thing we intend to produce, and know what we have chosen to produce before we make it. (3) And though we, surely, are feeble and far inferior to God's power, we know and understand through the understanding he has granted to men. But for you, Heracleon, God-given understanding has resulted in harm, since you do not employ it in a godly way but in an evil pursuit.

5,4 But I shall say it again, why the mixture of the spiritual with the soulish and material? That is, of what you call an inner man, united with the second and third "outer man," I mean with the soul and the body?

---

[17] The performance of the last rites, which they accept in hope of rising to the highest heaven.

[18] Ps. 68:3

(5) And if it is by the will of the power on high, the Father of all—I mean your "Depth"—then, as I said, the creation around us here, which has been commingled with them, is not incompatible with the things on high. For it is with the consent of the Father on high that the spark, your "spiritual" and inmost man, has been sent down from him from above. (6) And if you say that the Demiurge who is inferior and defective, or the Mother whom you call Achamoth, has received power—that is, spirituality—from above, then the Demiurge cannot be defective and ignorant, or your so-called "Mother" either. How can anyone be in ignorance of the thing he desires? If he desires the better at all, he knows what is right and good. And one who knows the good, and does not detest it but yearns for it, is not strange to the good.

6,1 And not to waste my time by spending in on the tramp's devices, I shall rest content with this. All his nonsense breaks down, since it is plainly acknowledged by everyone that the Lord of all is good, has foreknowledge, and is able to do everything; and that all nature, the creation that is in being, has been well made by him. (2) For nothing can exist without God except only sin, which has no original root and no permanence but appears in us as something imported, and in turn is brought to an end by us. Thus, in composing my heresiology, I have everywhere proved (3) that God, the maker and creator of all, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is one; and that his only-begotten Son, our Lord, Savior and God, is one; and that his Holy Spirit is one (4)—one holy, consubstantial Trinity. By this Trinity all things have been created well—none evil, but good, in keeping with the Goodness which consented to call them in that condition from non-being into being. (5) <To this God>, the Father in the Son, the Son with the Holy Spirit in the Father, be glory, honor and might, forever and ever. Amen.

6,6 But after once more giving a brief rebuttal of this sect I am going on to the rest, and will give my best refutation of each and so complete the overthrow of their pernicious wickedness. (7) For Heracleon may justly be called a lizard. This is not a snake but a hard-skinned beast as they say, something that crawls on four feet, like a gecko. The harm of its bite is negligible, but if a drop of its spittle strikes a food or drink, it causes the immediate death of those who have any. Heracleon's teaching is like that. (8) But as we have detected his poison too, and by God's power have wiped it off the throat or lips of those who would have been harmed, let us go over the rest, as I said, and give the rebuttal of their mischief.

37.

Against Ophites.[1] *Number seventeen, but thirty-seven of the series*

1,1 As I promised by the power of God, with God's help I shall also describe the Ophite sect, which follows next after the last stupidities. In some ways it takes the same course but in others, the customs and gestures of its members, it is different—so that everyone can see from the erratic wandering of the disagreement between them that these sects are guided by error, not truth. The Ophites will now be detected by the treatise, and their sort of stupidity refuted.

1,2 As I said, the Ophites took their cue from the sects of Nicolaus and the Gnostics and the ones before those. But they are called Ophites because of the serpent which they magnify. For they too disgorge strange things as though they were stuffed with the stinking food we mentioned before; and in their error, as I said, they glorify the serpent as a new divinity.

1,3 And see how far the serpent, the deceiver of the Ophites, has gone in mischief! Just as he deceived Eve and Adam at the beginning so even he does now by concealing himself—both now and in the Jewish period up until Christ's coming. (4) Then, even in later times, he seduces greedy humanity further with the food they got through him by disobedience; and he provokes them to further treachery and makes them rebels against the true God. He always promises big things, as he did also at the beginning. Even then he cheated them by saying, "Ye shall be as gods";[2] then, in time, he completed the multiform, monstrous illusion for them. (5) For he had spawned the blasphemous nonsense of idolatry and polytheism long before, by detaching them from the one true God. They were not gods (then), just as they are not (now); <only> God is God. But he was spawning polytheism, the madness for idols, and a deceitful doctrine beforehand.

1,6 But the snake which was visible at that time was not the only cause of this. It was the snake who spoke in the snake—I mean <the> devil—and disturbed the man's hearing through the woman. (7) And the tree was not sin either—God plants nothing evil—but the tree gave them knowledge so that they would know good and evil.

---

[1] The principal source of this Sect is Hipp. Synt., which is represented by PsT 2.1-4. Epiph uses this rather freely in the course of a homily against the Ophite heresy. He has also drawn on Irenaeus' paraphrase of an Ophitic source at 1.30.1-15. The description of the Ophite eucharist is amplified from oral sources. Epiph's account is not influenced by Hipp. Refut. 5.6.1-11 or by Orig. Cels. 6.24-35, though the latter is related to that of Irenaeus.

[2] Gen 3:5

1,8 And death did not come because of knowledge, but because of disobedience. Indeed the adversary's whole plot at that time was laid, not for the sake of food but to make them disobedient. (9) Hence they disobeyed then, and as an entirely just punishment were expelled from Paradise—not from God's hatred of them but from his care. For the Lord tells them, "Earth thou art, and unto earth shalt thou return."[3] (10) Like a potter the true Craftsman has charge of his own handiwork and vessel, and if this is later rendered defective by disobedience he must not leave it in that condition—when the vessel is still clay, as we might say, and has been rendered unuseable, as though by a crack. (11) Instead he must change the vessel into the original lump, to restore it to its pristine splendor and better still in the regeneration at the resurrection—(12) that is, <renew> the bodies of those who have committed the most grievous sins, and have repented, renounced their errors and been perfected in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, so that the resurrection of the body from the earth may take place as though the lump, softened by the Craftsman, were being restored to its original form and even better.

2,1 Such was the serpent's scheme against Eve. For the human race is greedy from the first, and always open to seduction by absurd doctrines and empty professions. (2) And in ancient times the serpent remained in hiding and did not disclose the full extent of its poison. But later, after Christ's incarnation, it coughed up and spat out the entire poisonous, wicked invention of its malice, for it proposed itself in the minds of its dupes for glorification and worship as God.

2,3 But the same serpent is recognizable as the author of the deception, both from this school of its followers and from the visible snake. Indeed, sacred scripture calls the devil a serpent; certainly not because he looks like one, but because he appears extremely crooked to men, and because of the treacherous fraud which was at the first perpetrated through a snake.

2,4 In the eyes, then, of those who recognize the truth, this doctrine is a ridiculous thing and so are its adherents who honor the serpent as God. No longer able to deceive the masculine reason which has received the power of the truth from the Lord, the devil turns to the feminine—that is, to men's ignorance—and convinces the ignorant, since he cannot deceive sound reason. (5) He always makes his approach to feminine whims, pleasure and lust—in other words, to the womanish ignorance in men, not to

[3] Gen 3:19

the firm reason which understands everything logically and recognizes God by the law of nature. (6) For their snake says it is Christ. Or rather, it does not—it cannot talk—but the devil does, who has prepared their minds to think in this way.

2,7 Thus, on seeing the snake, who will not recognize the adversary and flee? This is why the Lord assigned enmity against the human race to this particular snake—since, being his pet, it was wholly the devil's instrument, and through it he deceived the man in Paradise—so that, because they had seen the enmity of this visible snake they would flee the plot of its treachery and practically hate even the sight of it.

3,1 These so-called Ophites too ascribe all knowledge to this snake, saying that it became the beginning of men's knowledge,[4] and through mythology they slip the things in that they think are mysteries,[5] though they are mimes, full of absurdity and nonsense.

3,2 For these are certainly myths: They claim that Aeons were emitted from the Aeon on high, and that Ialdabaoth came into being on a lower level.[6] But he was emitted in accordance with the weakness and ignorance of his own mother, that is, the supernal Prunicus.[7] (3) For they say this Prunicus had come down into the waters and become mingled with them, but could not go back up because of being mingled with the weight of matter. For she has been intermingled with the waters and matter, and can no longer withdraw. (4) But she heaved herself up with an effort and stretched herself out, and thus <the> upper heaven was formed. And as she was fixed in place, no longer able either to go up or to come down but fixed and stretched out in the middle, there she remained. (5) For she could not sink down because she had no affinity (with what was below her); but she could not go up because she was heavy from the matter which she had taken on.[8]

---

[4] Cf. PsT 2.1. The snake is "the instructor" at Nat. Arc. 89,31-32; 90,6; Orig. Wld. 118,24-119,18; 119,34-120,6. At Iren. 1.30.15 Sophia herself becomes the snake. For a discussion of this subject see Pagels, *Adam, Eve and the Serpent*.

[5] Epiph is referring to what he believes is the Ophite eucharist; see below at 5,6-8.

[6] PsT 2.2: dicunt enim de illo summo primario Aeoni complures aeones exstitisse inferiores, omnibus tamen istis Aeonem antestare, cuius sit nomen Ialdabaoth.

[7] At Tri. Trac. 105,10-19 the Logos brings forth the Demiurge "[forgetfully], ignorantly and [defectively], and in all the other weak ways." For Prunicus as the mother of Ialdabaoth see Iren. 1.30.4-5. See also p. 00 n. 00.

[8] PsT. 2.2 where, however, this is said of Ialdabaoth. A more elaborate version of all this is found at Iren. 1.30.3.

3,6 But when Ialdabaoth[9] had been emitted in her ignorance he went to the very bottom and begot seven sons,[10] who begot seven heavens.[11] And he closed off the space above him and hid it from view, so that the seven sons he had emitted, being lower down than he, would not know what was above him, but no one at all but him.[12] And he, they say, is the God of the Jews, Ialdabaoth. (7) But this is not so, of course not! God the Almighty will judge them, for he is God both of Jews and Christians, and everyone, and not any Ialdabaoth, as their silly story has it.

4,1[13] Then, they say, when the heights had been closed off by Ialdabaoth's design, these seven sons he had begotten—whether they were aeons, or gods, or angels, they use various terms for them—fashioned the man in the image of their father Ialdabaoth. Not easily or quickly, however, but in the same way in which the earlier sects had made it out in their drivel. For these people too say, "The man was a creeping thing like a worm, not able either to look up or get to his feet.'"[14] (2) But as a scheme against Ialdabaoth the supernal Mother, the one called Prunicus[15]—wishing to empty Ialdabaoth of his power[16] which he had gotten from her by participation[17]—worked in him on the man his sons had formed,[18] intending to drain his power and send a spark[19] from him, the soul supposedly,[20] upon the man. (3) And then, they say, the man stood on his feet, rose in mind above the eight heavens, and recognized and praised the Father on high who is above Ialdabaoth.[21]

4,4 And then, distressed because the things high up above him had been recognized, Ialdabaoth stared bitterly down at the dung of matter and sired a power with a snake-like appearance,[22] which they also call his

---

[9] Cf. PsT 2.2 and Iren. 1.30.3 See also p. 00 n. 00.
[10] Cf. PsT 2.2; Iren. 1.30.3; Nat. Arc. 94,34-95,5; Corp. Herm. I.9.
[11] Cf. Apocry. Jn. II,1 11,4-8.
[12] PsT. 2.3 and Iren. 1.30.6. Cf. Tri. Trac. 79,12-19; 80,24-30; Nat. Arc. 94,4-95,5.
[13] With 4,1-2 cf. Pst 2.3 and Iren. 1.30.6. See also p. 00 n. 00.
[14] PsT 2.3; Iren. 1.30.6. And see p. 00 n. 00.
[15] For Prunicus see p. 85 n. 9.
[16] Iren. 1.30.6: et hoc Sophia operante uti et illius (Ialdabaoth) evacuet ab humectatione luminis etc. See p. 88 n. 16.
[17] Cf. Apocry. Jn. II,110,19-21; 11,8-9; 13,1-5, and the robbery of Pistis Sophia's light-power at PS 1.31 (MacDermot p. 46). See further p. 65 n. 18.
[18] I.e., she is the real agent at Gen 2:7.
[19] Cf PsT 2.4. For the hypostatized "spark" as an emanation in the heavens see Apocry. Jn.6,13-18; Para. Shem 31,22-23; 33,30-34; 46,13-15; *Ginza* 467,30-31. See p. 72 n. 12.
[20] Cf. Tri. Trac. 105,29-106,5.
[21] For the superiority of the first man to his makers see Apocry. Jn II,1 19,32-20,9; 20,28-31; Apoc. Ad. 64,14-19, and in Mandaean literature, *Ginza* 107,14-15; 465,24-27.
[22] Cf. PsT 2.4; Iren. 1.30.5; Acts of Philip 130 (James p. 449).

son. (5) And so, they say, this son was sent on his mission and deceived Eve. And she listened to him, believed him as a son of God,[23] and because of her belief ate from the tree of knowledge.[24]

5,1 Then, whenever they are describing this foolishness and the absurdity of this practice[25]—now that they have composed the tragic piece, as we might say, and this comic opera—they begin to point certain things out to us in support of their false so-called "gods." They say, "Are not our intestines also, by which we live and are nourished, shaped like a serpent?"[26] (2) And in support of their imposture and silly opinion they introduce any number of further points for their dupes. "We glorify the serpent for this reason," they say; "because it has been a cause if their knowledge for the many."[27]

5,3 Ialdabaoth, they say, did not want the Mother on high, or the Father, remembered by men. But the serpent convinced them and brought them knowledge, and taught the man and the woman the whole of the knowledge of the mysteries on high. (4) Hence his father—Ialdabaoth, that is—was angry because of the knowledge he had given men, and threw him down from heaven. (5) And therefore these people who possess the serpent's portion and nothing else, call the serpent a king from heaven. And so, they say, they glorify him for such knowledge and offer him bread.

5,6 For they have a real snake and keep it in a basket of some sort. When it is time for their mysteries they bring it out of the den, spread loaves around on a table, and call the snake to come; and when the den is opened it comes out. And then the snake—which comes up of its own accord and by its villainy—already knowing their foolishness, crawls onto the table and coils up on the loaves. And this they call a perfect sacrifice.

5,7 And so, as I have heard from someone, not only do they break the loaves the snake has coiled on and distribute them to the communicants, but each one kisses the snake on the mouth besides—whether the snake has been charmed into tameness by some sort of sorcery, or coaxed by some

---

[23] PsT. 2.4: cui Eva quasi filio Dei crediderat. Cf. Iren. 1.30.7; Apocry. Jn. II,1 22,3-9 where Christ, not the serpent, gives the command to eat. And see n. 4 above. For a discussion of Gnostic views of Eve see "Gnostic Improvisations on Genesis" in Pagels, *Adam. Eve, and the Serpent* pp. 57-77.

[24] Cf. Iren. 1.30.7.

[25] Their worship of the snake.

[26] Iren. 1.30.15: Sed et propter positionem intestinorum nostrorum, per quae esca infertur, eo quod talem figuram habeant, ostendentem absconditam generatricem Serpentis figurae substantiam in nobis.

[27] Cf. Or. Wld. 118,24-119,18; Nat. Arc. 89,31-90,19.

other act of the devil for their deception. (8) But they worship an animal of that sort and call what has been consecrated by its coiling around it the eucharistic element.[28] And they offer a hymn to the Father on high—again, as they say, through the snake—and so conclude their mysteries.

6,1 But anyone would call <this> foolishness and sheer nonsense. And it will not require refutation by research in sacred scripture; to anyone with godly soundness of mind its absurdity will be self-evident. For all their drivel will at once appear as something silly. (2) If they say hat there is a "Prunicus," as I have already remarked, how can one fail to detect the unsoundness of their notion from the very name? Anything called "seductive" is unseemly. But if it is unseemly it cannot be ranked among things to be preferred. And how can an unseemly thing be praiseworthy?

6,3 And how can it be anything but mythology to say that Prunicus drained Ialdabaoth, and that the spark went down below from him when he was drained; but that once it had lodged in the man, it recognized the person above the person who had been drained? (4) What a very great surprise that the man, with the tiniest of sparks in him, recognizes more than the angels who fashioned him! For the angels, or sons of Ialdabaoth, did not recognize the things above Ialdabaoth; but the man they had made did, by means of the spark!

6,5 Ophites refute themselves with their own doctrines by glorifying the snake at one moment, but at the next making him a deceiver who came to Eve when they say, "he deceived Eve."[29] (6) And they sometimes proclaim him Christ, but sometimes a son of the higher Ialdabaoth, who wronged his sons by shutting off the knowledge of <the> realms on high from them and despised both the Mother and the Father on high, in order to keep the sons he had sired from honoring the Father above him.

6,7 How can the serpent be a heavenly king if he has rebelled against the Father? And if he gives knowledge, why is he denounced as having fooled Eve with a deception? Someone who instills knowledge through deceit is no longer giving knowledge, but ignorance instead of knowledge; and one can truly see that, among them, this is the case. For they have ignorance and think it is knowledge—though when they call their own "knowledge" deceit and ignorance, in this they are telling the truth!

7,1 They cite other texts as well, and say that Moses too lifted the bronze serpent up in the wilderness and exhibited it for the healing of

---

[28] PsT 2.1: Ipsum (serpentem) introducunt ad benedicenda eucharistia sua.
[29] 2 Cor 11:3

persons who had been bitten by a snake.[30] For they say that that sort of thing serves as the cure for the bite. (2) But once more, they are making these declarations against themselves. For if the bites were snake's bites, and these were harmful, then the serpent is not good. The thing Moses held up in those days effected healing by the sight of it—not because of the nature of the snake but by the good pleasure of God who, by means of the snake, was making a sort of antidote for those who were bitten at that time. (3) It is no surprise if a person is cured through the things by which he was injured. And let no one speak ill of God's creation—as other erring persons do in their turn.

7,4 However, this served the people in the wilderness as a type, for the reason the Lord gives in the Gospel when he comes, "as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up"[31]—which indeed has been done. (5) For dishonoring the Savior like a serpent they were injured by the serpent's scheme, I mean the devil's. And as healing came to those who had been bitten by the lifting up of the serpent, so, at Christ's crucifixion, deliverance has come to our souls from the bites of sin which we have gotten.

7,6 But the same people cite this very text as evidence and say, "Do you not see how the Savior said, 'As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up?'[32] And on this account," they say, "he also says in another passage, 'Be ye wise as the serpent and harmless as the dove.' "[33] And what God has rightly ordained for us as symbols of teaching they cite in their own deluded sense.

8,1 For our Lord, the divine Word Jesus Christ, begotten of the Father before all ages without beginning and not in time, is not a serpent—heaven forbid!—but came himself to combat the serpent. (2) If he says, "Be ye wise as the serpent and harmless as the dove,"[34] we must inquire and learn why he introduced these two figures, of the serpent and of the dove, for our instruction. (3) There is nothing wise about a snake except for <the> two following things. When it is being hunted it knows that its whole life is in its head, and it is afraid of the order once given about it by God for the man's sake, "Thou shalt guard against its head, and it shall guard against thy heel."[35] So it coils its whole body over its head and hides its skull, but

[30] Cf. PsT 2.11; Hipp. Refut. 5.16.7-8.
[31] 1 John 3:14
[32] John 3:14
[33] Matt. 10:16
[34] Matt. 10:16
[35] Gen. 3:15

with extreme villainy surrenders the rest of its body. (4) In the same way the only-begotten God, who came forth from the Father, wills that in a time of persecution and a time of temptation we surrender our whole selves to fire and sword, but that we guard our "head"—in other words, that we do not deny Christ, since "The head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man, and the head of Christ is God,"[36] as the apostle says.

8,5 Again, as the naturalists say of this beast, the snake has another kind of wisdom. When it is thirsty and goes from its den to water to drink, it does not bring its poison with it but leaves it in its den, and then goes and takes its drink from the water. (6) Let us imitate this ourselves so that, when we go to God's holy church for prayer or God's mysteries, we do not bring evil, pleasure, passion, enmity or anything else in our thoughts.

8,7 For that matter, how can we imitate the dove either without keeping clear of evil—though certainly, in many ways doves are not praiseworthy. (8) Doves are insatiable and incessantly promiscuous, lecherous, given to the pleasure of the moment, and weak and small besides. (9) But because of the harmlessness, patience and forbearance of doves—and even more, because of the Holy Spirit's appearance in the form of a dove—the divine Word would have us imitate the will of the Holy Spirit and the harmlessness of the harmless dove and be wise in good but innocent in evil.

And their entire dramatic piece has been demolished. (10) For straight off, by saying, "I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his villainy, so your minds should be corrupted from the sincerity and simplicity of Christ, and from righteousness,"[37] the apostle assigns villainy and treachery to none more than to the devil and the serpent. (11) You see how the apostle pronounced the serpent's dealings with Eve seduction, frightful villainy and deceit, and made it clear that nothing praiseworthy had been done by it.

9,1 Hence their stupidity is discernible and obvious in all respects to anyone who is willing to know the teaching of the truth and the knowledge of the Holy Spirit. (2) But not to waste time, now that I have sailed through this fierce, hazardous storm at sea as well, I shall ready my barque for its other sea voyages, carefully guarding my tongue by God's power and the prayers of saints, (3) so as to espy the tossing of the wild waves as I sail by, and the forms of the poisonous beasts in the seas, but be able to cross and

[36] 1 Cor 11:3
[37] 2 Cor 11:3

reach the fair haven of the truth by prayer and supplication, untouched by the poison of sea eel, stingray, dragon, shark and scorpaena. (4) In my case too, the text, "They that go down to the sea shall tell the virtues of the Lord,"[38] will prove applicable. So I shall make my way to another sect after this, for its description.

38.

Against Cainites.[1] *Number eighteen but thirty-eight of the series*

1,1 Certain persons are called Cainites because they have taken the name of their sect from Cain. For these people praise Cain and count him as their father—since they too, in a manner of speaking, are being driven by a different surge of waves without being outside of the same swell and surf; and are peering out of thorny undergrowth, without being outside of the whole heap of thorns even though they differ in name. For there are many kinds of thorn, but the painfulness of being pricked by thorns is in them all.

1,2 Cainites say that Cain is the scion of the stronger power and the authority above; so, moreover, are Esau, Korah and his companions, and the Sodomites.[2] But Abel is the scion of the weaker power. (3) <They acknowledge> all of these as worthy of their praise and kin to themselves. For take pride in their kinship with Cain, the Sodomites,[3] Esau and Korah. And these, they say, represent the perfect knowledge from on high. (4) Therefore, they say, though the maker of this world made it his business to destroy them, he could do them no harm; they were hidden from him and translated to the aeon on high, from which the stronger power comes. For Wisdom allowed them to approach her because they were her own.[4]

1,5 And they say that because of this Judas had found out all about them. For they claim him too as kin and regard him as possessed of superior knowledge, so that they even cite a short work in his name which they call

---

[38] Ps 106:23-24

[1] The primary sources of Sect 38 are Hipp. Synt. (see PsT 2.5 and Iren. 1.31.1-2).

[2] Iren. 1.31.1, cf. PsT 2.5.

[3] The Sodomites are witnesses to the truth at Para. Shem 29,12-29. At Gos. Egyp. III,2 56,4-13; 60,9-18, Sodom and Gomorrah are the source of the heavenly seed of Seth. In the passages Apoc. Adam 71,8-72,14 and 74,26-76,7 they are (75,1-3) "the great men who have not been defiled."

[4] Iren. 1.1.31. See p. 291 n. 24.

a Gospel of Judas.[5] (6) And they likewise forge certain other works against "Womb." They call this "Womb" the maker of this entire vault of heaven and earth and say, as Carpocrates does, that no one will be saved unless they progress through all (possible) acts.[6]

2,1 For while each of them is doing some unspeakable thing supposedly with this excuse, performing obscenities and committing every sin there is, he invokes the name of each angel—both real angels, and the ones they fictitiously call angels. And he attributes some wicked commission of every sin on earth to each of them, by offering his own action in the name of whichever angel he wishes. (2) And whenever they do these things they say, "This or that angel, I am performing thy work. This or that authority, I am doing thy deed."[7] (3) And this is what they call perfect "knowledge," since, if you please, they have taken their cue for venturing without fear on wicked obscenities from the mothers and fathers of sects whom we have already mentioned—I mean the Gnostics and Nicolaus, and their allies Valentinus and Carpocrates.

2,4 Further, I have now learned of a book in which they have forged certain assertions which are full of wickedness, containing such things as "This is the angel who blinded Moses. These are the angels who hid the companions of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, and removed them elsewhere."

2,5 But again, others forge another brief work in the name of the apostle Paul, full of unspeakable abominations, which the so-called Gnostics also use, (and) which they call an Ascension of Paul—taking their cue from the apostle's statement that he has ascended to the third heaven and heard ineffable words, which man may not speak. And these, they say, are the ineffable words.[8]

2,6 But they teach these things and others of the sort for the sake of honoring the wicked and repudiating the good. For < they claim >, as I said, that Cain is the offspring of the stronger power and Abel of the weaker. These powers had intercourse with Eve[9] and sired Cain and Abel; and Cain

---

[5] Iren. 1.31.1: Judae Evangelium illud vocantes. It is generally agreed that this is the Gospel of Judas of the Codex Tchacos.

[6] Iren. 1.31.2: Hysteran autem factorem caeli et terrae vocant. At Apocry. II,1 Jn. 5,4-5 Barbelo is First Thought, or the womb, of everything, cf. Pr. Thank. 64,21-30. For Womb see also Para. Shem 4,30; 6,7 and *passim.*

[7] For the whole of this see Iren. 1.31.2.

[8] The Apocalypse of Paul, NHC V,2, says nothing of the "unutterable words" although at 22,29-23,5 it gives a speech Paul makes in order to pass above the Ancient of Days.

[9] Cf. Apocry. Jn. II,1 23,35-24,25 and the archons' attempt to abuse Eve at Nat. Arc. 89,17-30; 116,33; Orig. Wld. 116,12-117,14. At Iren. 1.30.7 the archons sire angels.

was the son of the one, Abel of the other. (7) And <both> Adam and Eve were the offspring of powers or angels like these. And the children the powers had begotten, I mean Cain and Abel, quarreled, and the scion of the stronger power murdered the scion of the lesser and weaker.

3,1 But they too interweave the same mythology with their gift of ignorance about these same deadly poisons by advising their followers that everyone must choose the stronger power, and separate from the lesser, feeble one—that is, from the one which made heaven, the flesh and the world—and rise above it to the uttermost heights through the crucifixion of Christ. (2) For this is why he came from above, they say, so that the stronger power might act in him by triumphing over the weaker and betraying the body. (3) And some of them say this; others, other things. For some say that Christ was betrayed by Judas because Christ was wicked, and wanted to pervert the provisions of the Law. For they commend Cain and Judas, as I said, and they say, "This is why he has betrayed him; he intended to abolish things that had been properly taught."

3,4 But others say, "No, he betrayed him even though he was good, in accordance with the heavenly knowledge. For the archons knew," they say, "that if Christ were surrendered to the cross the weaker power would be drained. (5) And when Judas found this out," they say, "he eagerly did everything he could to betray him, performing a good work for our salvation. And we must commend him and give him the credit, since the salvation of the cross was effected for us through him, and for that reason the revelation of the things on high."[10]

3,6 But they are deceived in every way in not honoring or praising anyone who is good. It is obvious that these things, I mean their ignorance and deceit, have been sown in them by the devil. (7) The scriptural words, "Woe unto them that call good evil and evil good, that put darkness for light and light for darkness; that call sweet bitter and bitter sweet,"[11] are applicable to them. (8) Old and New Testaments speak out in every way in denunciation of Cain's impiety. These on the contrary, lovers <of> darkness that they are and imitators of evildoers, hate Abel but love Cain and give their praise to Judas. (9) And they counterfeit a pernicious "knowledge" by setting up two powers, a weaker and stronger, which quarrel with each

[10] PsT 2.6 also gives two versions of Judas' motive, though they are not the same as those given here. At Gos. Jud. 56,19-20 Jesus says to Judas, "You will sacrifice the man who bears me," i.e., apparently, You will free me from my body of flesh. The text of Gos. Jud. 57,1-11 though very defective, seems to suggest that the consummation will result from Jesus' crucifixion. And see Fil. 34.1-2 and Iren 1.31.11.

[11] Isa. 5:20

other and see to it that there can be no changing of one's mind in the world, but of those who are born here, some are by nature derived from evil, others from goodness. They say that no one is good or bad by choice, but by nature.

4,1 And first, let us see how the Old Testament says of Cain, "Thou art cursed from the earth, which hath opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood at thy hand," and again, "Thou art cursed in thy works, and shalt go sighing and trembling upon the earth."[12] (2) And the Lord in the Gospel spoke of him in agreement with the Old Testament, when Jews told him, "We have God as our father."[13] But the Lord said to them, "Ye are sons of your father the devil, for he is a liar because his father was a liar. He was a murderer, and abode not in the truth. When he speaketh a lie he speaketh of his own, for his father was a liar also."[14]

4,3 And so, from hearing this said, the other sects allege that the devil is the father of the Jews, and that he has another father, and that his father in turn has a father. (4) But they are speaking impudently and blinding their own reason. They are tracing the devil's ancestry to the Lord of all, the God of the Jews, the Christians and all men, by saying that he is the father of the devil's father—the God who gave the Law through Moses and has done so many wonders!

4,5 But this is not so, beloved. To begin with, the Lord himself, who cares for us in all things, <meant> Judas when he said that their father was the devil—to keep us from deviating from the plain sense with one quibble and supposition after another. (6) He has called Judas both "Satan" and "devil" in saying to his disciples, "Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?"[15] meaning, not devil by nature but devil in intent. (7) Again, in another passage he says, "Father, Lord of heaven and earth, keep those whom thou hast given me. While I was with them I kept them, and none of them is lost but the son of perdition."[16] (8) Once more, he says elsewhere, "The Son of Man must be betrayed as it is written of him, but woe unto him by whom he shall be betrayed. It were better for him if he had not been born,"[17] and so on.

---

[12] Gen. 4:11-12
[13] John 8:41
[14] John 8:44
[15] John 6:70
[16] John 17:11-12
[17] Matt. 26:24

4,9 Hence we know from every source that he was speaking to the Jews about Judas. "For of whom a man is overcome, of the same he is brought in bondage";[18] and the person one trusts, him he has as his father and the author of his belief. (10) The Lord, then, says, "Ye are sons of your father, the devil,"[19] because they trusted Judas instead of Christ, just as Eve at the beginning turned away from God and trusted the serpent. (11) Then, he says it because Judas was not merely a liar but a thief as well, as the Gospel says. That was why he entrusted him with the bag—so that he would be without excuse when, from greed, he delivered his master into the hands of men.

4,12 Who is Judas' father then, the "liar before him," but Cain, whose imitator Judas was? Lying to his brother as though in affection, Cain deceived and cajoled him with the lie, and took him out to the plain, raised his hand and killed him. (13) Thus Judas too says, "What will ye give me, and I will deliver him unto you?"[20] and, "Whomsoever I kiss, that same is he; hold him fast."[21] And the betrayer said, "Hail, Master," when he came, honoring him with his lips, but with his heart far removed from God.

5,1 Hence this Judas, who became their father in denial of God and betrayal, a Satan and devil not by nature but in intent, has himself become a son by imitation of the murderer and liar, Cain. For Cain's "father" before him was a liar too—not Adam, but the devil—(2) whose imitator Cain became in fratricide, hatred and falsehood, and contradicting God by saying, "Am I my brother's keeper? I know not where he is."[22] (In the same way the devil says, "Doth Job fear God for nought?"[23] to the Lord.) (3) For since the devil himself deceived Adam and Eve with the lie, "Ye shall be as gods and shall not die,"[24] telling an untruth and showing pretended friendship, Cain, in imitation of him, deceived his brother with a pretense of affection by saying, "Let us go out to the plain."[25]

5,4 This is why St. John too said, "He that hateth his brother, the same is not made perfect in love, but is of Cain, who slew his brother. And wherefore slew he him? Because his works were evil and he envied

---

[18] 2 Pet. 2:19
[19] John 8:44
[20] Matt 26:48-49
[21] Matt 25:48
[22] Gen 4:9
[23] Job 1:9
[24] Gen. 3:4;5
[25] Gen 4:8

his brother's, for they were good."[26] (5) So these people who prefer to envy Abel with his good works but honor Cain—how can they not be convicted when the Savior expressly pronounces the severe sentence against them by saying , "Of this generation all righteous blood shall be required, from the blood of righteous Abel which was shed at the beginning unto Zacharias the prophet, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar,"[27] and so on.

6,1 Hence Judas did not betray the Savior because of knowledge as these people say; nor are the Jews to be rewarded for crucifying the Lord, though we indeed have salvation through the cross. (2) Judas did not betray him so that it would bring about our salvation, but from the ignorance, envy and greed of the denial of God. (3) Even if scripture can say that Christ was to be surrendered to a cross—or even if the sacred scripture predicts the offenses that will be committed by ourselves in the last days—none of us, who commit the transgressions, can find any defense by alleging the testimony of the scripture that foretells the commission of them. (4) We do not do these things because scripture <fore>told them, but scripture foretold them because we would do them—from God's foreknowledge and to remove any suspicion that God, who is good and yet inflicts his wrath upon sinners, can be ruled by emotion. (5) For God's anger at every sinner does not stem from emotion. The Godhead is impassible and visits its wrath on men, not because it has been seized with irritation or mastered and overcome by anger. God shows his impassibility by telling us beforehand of the judgment to come and the just penalty to be exacted, to indicate the impassibility of the Godhead.

6,6 Hence scripture foretold these things, forewarning and teaching us in accordance with its foreknowledge, so that we need not encounter the implacable wrath of God—a wrath not determined by emotion and not the result of mastery by it, but which has been prepared beforehand, with entire justice, for men who commit sin and do not truly repent.

7,1 So also with the cross. It was not because sacred scripture said they would that the Jews crucified the Savior and Judas betrayed him; but because Judas would betray, and the Jews crucify him, sacred scripture foretold this in the Old Testament and the Lord in the Gospel. (2) Hence Judas did not betray the Lord—as the Cainites say he did—in awareness of the benefit that would come to the world. He betrayed him knowing that he was his master, but not knowing that he would be the world's salvation. (3) How could he be the one who saw to men's salvation, the man who heard "son

[26] 1 John 3:15; 4:18; 3:12
[27] Matt 23:35

of perdition"[28] from the Savior himself; "Better for that man if he had not been born";[29] "Friend, do that for which thou art come";[30] "One of you shall betray me";[31] "He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me";[32] (here the Gospel quotes an earlier text from the Psalter); and, "Woe unto him by whom the Son of Man is betrayed?"[33]

7,4 For Judas himself made the whole truth about himself apparent; and even <of> himself, though unwillingly, he exposed the stupidity of those who praise him, by repenting later after getting the thirty pieces of silver as his price, and returning the money as though he had done something bad—bad for himself, and bad for the executioners as well. (5) But to do good of himself, for us and for the world, the Lord has surrendered himself to become our salvation.

7,6 Hence we do not thank the betrayer, Judas, but the merciful Savior who laid down his life for us—for his own sheep, as he himself said. (7) If Judas thought he had done a good thing, why did he later say, "I repent that I have betrayed innocent blood,"[34] and return the money? As it was written of him in the prophets, "And he returned the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued of the children of Israel."[35] And again, in another prophet, "If ye deem proper, give me my price, or forbear." (8) And again, in another prophet, "And they gave the silver, the price of him that was valued, and he said, Cast it into the refiner's furnace, and see whether it be proved, as I was proved of the children of Israel."[36]

8,1 And how many points can be gathered from the sacred scripture about the prophecies which have been fulfilled in our Lord—not concerning Judas' work for good, but concerning the delivery for us, not of necessity but of his free choice, of our Savior and Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God, and the provision of the cross for our salvation! (2) But I know I am stringing the texts out too long—as one more prophet says, "Let his habitation be desolate, and his bishopric let another take,"[37] <meaning that Judas[38] died badly>. (4) Thus the apostles made Matthias one of them in his stead,

---

[28] John 17:12
[29] Matt 26:24
[30] Matt. 26:30
[31] Matt. 26:30
[32] John 13:18; Ps. 40:10
[33] Matt 26:24
[34] Matt 27:4
[35] Cf. Zech. 11:12
[36] Zech. 11:12-13; Matt 27:9
[37] Acts 1:20; Ps. 68:6; 108:8
[38] Acts 1:18; Matt. 27:5

saying "from which Judas by transgression fell, that he might go to his own place."[39] (5) And which "place" but the one the Savior had designated for him by saying that he was a "son of perdition?" For this "place of perdition" was reserved for him where he obtained a portion instead of a portion and, instead of apostolic office, the place of perdition.

8,6 But I think enough has been said about this, beloved. Let us go on again to another to expose once more the obscure, savage, poisonous teachings of the members of the remaining sects who, to the world's harm, have gotten cracked by the bogus inspiration of the devil. (7) After exposing the opinion of such people who yearn for the worst—an opinion that resembles poisonous dung beetles—and crushing it by God's power because of its harmfulness, let us call on God for aid, sons of Christ, as we set our minds to the investigation of the others.

39.

Against Sethians.[1] *Number nineteen, but thirty-nine of the series*

1,1 "Sethians" is yet another Sect, of that name. It is not to be found everywhere, nor is the one before it, the so-called sect of "Cainites"; most of these too have probably been uprooted from the world by now. For that which is not of God will not stand; it flourishes for a while, but has no permanence at all.

1,2 I think I may have met with this sect in Egypt too—I do not precisely recall the country in which I met them. And I found out some things about it by inquiry in an actual encounter, but have learned other things from treatises.

1,3 For these Sethians proudly trace their ancestry to Seth the son of Adam,[2] glorify him, and attribute to him whatever <is held> to be virtuous—the marks of virtue and righteousness, and anything of the kind.

---

[39] Acts 1:25

[1] The source of this Sect is primarily literary (cf. what Epiph says at 1,2) and seems to be Hipp. Synt., which is represented by PsT 2,7-9. Some of Epiph's information, however, was obtained at first hand. The "Sethians" of Hipp. Refut. 5.19-22 are not relevant here. On the subject of the Sethians see Schenke, Turner, Wisse.

[2] In several NHC tractates Gnostics are represented as the "seed" (σπέρμα) or "race" (γένος) of Seth, distinct from other peoples. See Apocry. Jn. II,1 9,14-16; 25,9-16; Gos. Egyp. III,2 59,9-17; 60,2-18; 61,23-62,19; 64,22-24; Apoc. Adam 65,3-9; 66,1-6; 71,8-72,14; 85,19-22; Gr. Seth 63,8-9; Zost. 130,14-17; Stel. Seth 119,2; 120,1-16. At Apocry. Jn. II,1 25,1-2; Gos. Egyp. III,2 56,13-22 this seed or race is said to be preexistent; it comes to earth later. It is usually called σπορά rather than σπέρμα by Epiph.

What is more, they even call him Christ[3] and maintain that he is Jesus. (4) And they give their teaching in the following form: all things, they say, are the work of angels[4] and not of the power on high.

2,1 For in this regard they agree with the previous sect, the sect of the Cainites: Two men were born at the very beginning, and Cain and Abel were the sons of the two. And in quarreling about them the angels went to <war with> each other, and so brought it about that Abel was killed by Cain. (2) For the angels' quarrel was a struggle over the human stocks,[5] since these two men, the one who had sired Cain and the one who had sired Abel, <were at odds with each other>. (3) But the power on high has won, the one they call Mother and Female.[6] For they have the idea that there are both mothers on high, and females and males, and they all but say "kindreds and patriarchies" too.

2,4[7] Since the so-called Mother and Female had won, finding that they had killed Abel, they say, she reflected, caused the generation of Seth, and put her power in him—planting. in him a seed of the power from above, and the spark that was sent from above for a first planting and origin of the seed. (5) And this is the origin of righteousness, and the election of a seed and stock, so that the powers of the angels who made the world and the two primordial men would be purged by *this origin and this seed. (6) For this reason the stock of Seth is derived separately from this origin, since it is elect and distinct from the other stock.

2,7 For as time went on, they say, and the two stocks, Cain's and Abel's, were together, <and> had come together because of great wickedness and had intercourse, the Mother of all, who had kept watch, wanted to make the seed of men pure, as I said, since Abel had been killed. And she chose this Seth and made him pure,[8] and planted the seed of her power and purity in him alone.

---

[3] Cf. PsT 2.9 and see Gos. Jud. 52,4-6: The first is [S]eth, who is called 'the Christ.' Van der Vliet, however, considers this a textual error: see his "Judas and the Stars" pp. 146-151. Seth is clearly identified with Jesus at Gos. Egyp. CG IV,2, 62,24-64,9; 65,16-18 and perhaps at Apoc. Adam 76,8-77,18; Gr. Seth 51,20-52,10, though in this latter tractate the name Seth is found only in the title. See n. 13 below.

[4] Cf. PsT 4.7.

[5] PsT 2.7. Val. Exp. 38,24-33: And Cain [killed] Abel his brother, for [the Demiurge] breathed into [them] his spirit. And there [took place] the struggle with the apostasy of the angels and mankind, those of the right with those of the left, and those in heaven with those on earth, the spirits with the carnal, and the Devil against God. See also Tri. Trac. 83,34-84,36.

[6] The Holy Spirit is Prima Femina et Mater viventium at Iren. 1.30.1-2. PsT 2.7 says only "Mater." See p. 00.00.

[7] With 2,7 cf. PsT 2.7.

[8] καθαρὸν ἔδειξεν. Or: showed him to be pure.

3,1 But once more, seeing a great deal of intercourse and unruly appetition on the part of angels and men since the two breeds had come together for intercourse, and seeing that their unruliness had caused certain origins of (new) breeds, Mother and Female returned and brought the flood, and destroyed the entire human race <and> all of the opposing stock—in order that, supposedly, only the pure stock that derived from Seth and was righteous would remain in the world, for the origin of the stock from on high and the spark of righteousness.[9]

3,2 But without her knowledge the angels in their turn slipped Ham, who, was of their seed,[10] into the ark. For they say that of the eight persons who were saved in Noah's then ark, seven were of the pure stock but one was Ham, who belonged to the other power and got in unknown to the Mother[11] on high.[12] (3) A plan of this sort, of the angels' contrivance, was thus carried out. For, they say, since the angels had learned that all their seed would be wiped out in the flood, they smuggled Ham in by some knavery to preserve the wicked stock they had created.

3,4 And for this reason forgetfulness and error have overtaken men, and the inordinate impulses of sins and a conglomeration of evil have arisen in the world. And thus the world reverted to its ancient state of disorder, and was as filled with evils as it had been at the beginning, before the flood. (5) But from Seth by descent and lineage came Christ, Jesus himself, not by generation but by appearing miraculously in the world. He is Seth himself, who visited men then and now[13] because he was sent from above by the Mother.

4,1 This is the way they say all this came about. But doctrines like these are foolish, weak and full of nonsense, as everyone can plainly see. (2) Two men were not formed (at the beginning) but one man, Adam, and from Adam came Cain, Abel and Seth. And <the human stocks>

---

[9] PsT 2.8. At Gos. Egyp. III,2 61,1-5 and Apoc. Adam 69,2-18 the Flood is sent to wipe out the seed of Seth.

[10] The seed of Ham and Japheth mingle with the seed of Seth at Apoc. Adam 73,13-29.

[11] "The Mother" is found in a Sethian hymn at Gos. Egyp. III,2 67,4-6.

[12] PsT 2.9

[13] At Gos. Egyp. III,2. 51,5-22 the heavenly Seth is the son of Adamas and the father of "the immoveable race." At 55,17-56,21 he receives his seed through Plesithea (the equivalent of Eve?) and places it in the "fourth aeon." At 59,9-60,18 he comes to earth bringing his seed, which he places in Sodom. At 62,24-64,8 he is "sent," as Jesus, "to save her (the race) that went astray." See also 65,16-18 and 63,4-8.

In the simpler version of Apocry. Jn. II,1 Seth is the son of Pigera-Adamas and is placed over the "second aeon" (8,29-9,14). At 24,35-25,2 Adam begets the earthly Seth in the likeness of the (heavenly) "son of man." At Gos. Judas 52,4-6, strangely, "Seth, who is called Christ" is one of the five angels who rule over the underworld. But see n. 3 above.

up until the flood cannot derive from two men but must derive from one, since all the stocks have their own origins in the world <from> Adam. (3) And in turn, every human breed since the flood derives from Noah, the one man not derive—not from different men but from one, Noah, Seth's lineal descendant; and it is not divided into two, but is one stock. (4) And so Noah's wife, his sons Shem, Ham and Japheth, and the three wives of his sons, are all trace their ancestry to Seth, not to the two men of the Sethians' mythology, who never existed.

5,1 They compose certain books in the names of great men and say that there are seven books in Seth's name,[14] and give the name, "Strangers," to other, different books.[15] And they compose another in the name of Abraham which they call an "apocalypse" and is full of wickedness, and others in the name of Moses., and others in others' names.

5,2 Lowering their own minds to great absurdity they say that Seth's wife is a certain Horaia. Take a look at their stupidity, beloved, so that your will despise their melodrama, mythological nonsense and fictitious claptrap in every way. (3) There are certain other sects which say there is a power to whom they give the name "Horaia." Now these people say that the one whom others regard as a power and call Horaia, is Seth's wife!

5,4 Thus we can show—as you know, beloved—both that Seth was a real man and that he got no unusual endowment from above, but was the blood brother of Cain and Abel, from one father and one mother. (5) For scripture says, "Adam knew Eve his wife, and she conceived and bare Cain"; and she named him Cain, meaning "acquisition," saying, "I have acquired a son through the Lord God."[16] (6) Again, in the case <of> Abel, "Adam knew Eve his wife and she conceived and bare a son and called his name Abel."[17] (7) And much farther on, after the death of Abel, "And Adam knew Eve, his wife, and she conceived and bare a son, and called his name Seth," meaning "recompense." "For," she said, "God hath raised up for me a seed instead of Abel, whom Cain slew."[18] (8) But the expression, "I have acquired *through God*," and " *God* hath raised up for me," show that

---

[14] Books of Seth in NHC are VII,2 *The Second Treatise of the Great Seth* and VII,5 *The Three Steles of Seth*. Gos. Egyp. III,2 68,10-12 attributes this book to Seth, and the same may be true of Allog. 68,25-28.

[15] For books termed Allogenes, "Stranger," see NHC XI,3 and Tractate 4 of the Codex Tchacos. Porphyry mentions an Apocalypse of Allogenes at Vita Plotini 16.

[16] Gen 4:1

[17] Cf. Gen 4:1-2.

[18] Gen 4:25

the one God, the maker of all is also the giver of these offspring. (9) And that Cain and Seth, at least, took wives is plain—for Abel was killed in his early youth, not yet married.

6,1 But as we find in Jubilees which is also called "The Little Genesis," the book even contains the names of both Cain's and Seth's wives,[19] so that the persons who recite myths to the world may be put to shame in every way. (2) For after Adam had sired sons and daughters it became necessary at that time that the boys marry their own sisters. Such a thing was not unlawful, as there was no other human stock. (3) Indeed, in a manner of speaking Adam himself practically married his own daughter who was fashioned from his body and bones and had been formed by God in conjunction with him, and it was not unlawful. (4) And his sons were married, Cain to the older sister, whose name was Saue; and a third son, Seth, who was born after Abel, to his sister named Azura.[20]

6,5 And Adam had other sons too as the Little Genesis says, nine after these three,[21] so that he had two daughters but twelve sons, one of whom was killed but eleven survived. (6) You have the reflection of them too in the Genesis of the World, the first Book of Moses, which says, "And Adam lived 930 years, and begat sons and daughters, and died."[22]

7,1 But when humanity had expanded and Adam's line was growing longer, the strict practice of lawful wedlock was gradually extended. (2) And then, since Adam had had children and children's children, and daughters were born to them in direct descent, they no longer took their own sisters in marriage. Even before the written Law given by Moses the rule of lawful wedlock was reduced to order, and they took their wives from among their cousins. (3) And now, while humanity was expanding in this way, the two stocks were commingled—Cain's with Seth's and Seth's with the other, and so were the other stocks of Adam's sons.

7,4 Then finally, when the flood had destroyed all of mankind at once, Noah alone, who found favor with God, was preserved, because he had been found righteous in that generation. (5) And as I said before, he prepared his ark by God's decree, as the true scriptures tell us. The same book of the truth states that he was preserved in it, and with him the seven souls I have mentioned—I mean his own wife and three sons, and their wives, likewise three.[23] (6) And the truth affirms that for this reason remnants of

---

[19] Jub. 4.9; 11
[20] Jub. 4.9-11
[21] Jub. 4.10
[22] Cf. Gen 15:3-5.
[23] Cf. Gen 7:7; 1 Pet 3:20.

the generation of men were again left in the world. And so, as time went on from generation to generation and with son succeeding father, the world had come to span five generations.

8,1 And the foundation of Babylon in Assyria took place at that time, and the tower that they built then. (2) And, as I have already explained in the foregoing Sects with regard to the series of generations I dealt with earlier, all humanity then consisted of 72 men, who were princes and patricians—32 of Ham's stock, 15 of Japheth's, and 25 of Shem's. And so the tower and Babylon were built.

8,3 After this tribes and languages were dispersed over the entire earth. And since the 72 <who> were then building the tower were scattered by the languages—because they had been confused, and <divorced> from the one language that they knew—each one, by God's will, was infused with a different language and acquired it. (4) The existence of the (various) languages from then until now began with them, so that <anyone who> cares to, can discover the originator of each language. For example Iovan, for whom the Ionians who possess the Greeks' ancient speech are named, acquired Greek.[24] Theras[25] acquired Thracian; Mosoch,[26] Mossynoecian; Thobel,[27] Thessalian; Lud,[28] Lydian; Gephar,[29] Gasphenian; Mistrem[30] Egyptian; Psous,[31] Axomitian; and Armot,[32] Arabian. And not to mention them individually, each of the rest was infused with his own tongue. And thus the continuation of every language in the world was extended.

9,1 Why is it, then, that these people have told their lies, interpolating their own mythology, imagining and dreaming of unreal things as though they were real, and banishing what is real from their own minds? But the whole thing is an idea of the devil which he has engendered in human souls. (2) It is amazing to see how he deceived man into many offenses and dragged him down to transgression, to fornication, adultery and incontinence, to the madness of idols, to sorcery and bloodshed, to rapine and insatiate greed, to trickery and gluttony, and any number of such things—but never before Christ's coming ventured to say a blasphemous word against his own Master or meditate open rebellion. (3) For he was awaiting

[24] Hipp. Chron. 60 (Bauer-Helm p. 12,4)
[25] Hipp. Chron. 63 (op. cit. p. 12,6-7)
[26] Hipp. Chron. 169 (op. cit. p. 26,9)
[27] Hipp. Chron. 61 (op. cit. p. 12,5)
[28] Hipp. Chron. 111 (op. cit. p. 18,13)
[29] Hipp. Chron. 168 (op. cit. p. 26,8)
[30] Hipp. Chron. 95 (op. cit. p. 17,2)
[31] Hipp. Chron. 96 (op cit. 17,8)
[32] Hipp. Chron. 178 (op. cit. p. 27,17)

Christ's coming as he says, "It is written of thee that he shall give his angels charge concerning thee, and in their hands they shall bear thee up."[33] (4) He had always heard the prophets proclaim the coming of Christ <and> that there would be a redemption of those who had sinned and yet repented through Christ, and he thought that he would obtain some mercy. (5) But when the wretch saw that Christ had not accepted his turnabout for salvation's sake he opened his mouth against his own Master and spewed the blasphemy out, implanting in men the suggestion that they deny their real Master and seek the one who was not real.

9,6 Now the Sethians too will be exposed in every way as victims of deception, by the following argument: Seth has died, and the years of his life are recorded. He went the way of all flesh after living for 912 years, having fathered sons and daughters as sacred scripture says. (7) And next his son, his name was Enosh, also lived for 905 years, and departed this life after fathering sons and daughters, as the same book of the truth says.

10,1 Therefore if Seth died then, and his sons in succession also lived and departed this life, how will it be found that he is the Lord who was conceived of the ever-virgin Mary after consenting to human life—who was begotten at no point in time, who is always with the Father as the divine Word subsistent; (2) but who came in the last days, fashioned flesh in his own image from a virgin womb and, having taken the human soul, thus became perfect man? (3) The Lord who proclaimed the mysteries of life to us, appointed his disciples as workers of righteousness, and instructed the human race in his teaching, himself and through them—not by revealing the teachings of the Sethians or calling himself Seth as they, foolishly and overcome by a sort of drunkenness, have lost the truth.

10,4 But now, though the <rebuttal of the> sect is brief, I do not need to extend its refutation, and am content with just what is here. Their stupidity is easy to puncture and is self-refuting and self-exposing, not only with regard to their kidnaping of Christ and their falsely alleged belief and affirmation that he is Seth, but because of the two men as well. (5) For if the powers had their origin from above, nothing which was done by the two powers was made and done without the one power—whom, indeed, they call the Mother of *all*. For the one power is plainly the cause of the two powers, and nothing that has been done, has been done without it. (6) And once the beginning is shown to be one, they will return to the confession that the Master of all, and the Creator and Maker of the whole, is one.

---

[33] Matt 4:6; Luke 4:11

10,7 But since we have said these things about this sect as well, beloved, and have exposed the poison of their reptilian brood of the asp family, let us once more go to another, in the same order of the treatise.

40.

Against Archontics.[1] *Number 20, but forty of the series*

1,1 A sect of Archontics comes after these although it is to be found in few places, or only in the province of Palestine. But by now they may also have brought their poison to Greater Armenia. (2) Moreover, this tare has already been sown in Lesser Armenia by a man who came from Armenia to live in Palestine during the reign of Constantius at about the time of his death. His name was Eutactus though he was "disorderly" rather (than "orderly"), and after learning this wicked doctrine he returned to his homeland and taught it.

1,3 As I said he got it—like getting poison from an asp—in Palestine from an old man unworthily named Peter, who used to live in the district of Eleutheropolis <and> Jerusalem, three mile-stones beyond Hebron; they call the village Kephar Baricha.

1,4 To begin with, this old man had an extraordinary garment, stuffed with hypocrisy. For he actually wore a sheep's fleece on the outside, and it was not realized that on the inside he was a ravening wolf. He appeared to be a hermit because he lived in a certain cave, gathered many, supposedly for the ascetic life, and he was called "father," if you please, because of his age and his dress. He had distributed his possessions to the poor, and he gave alms daily.

1,5 He had belonged to many sects in his early youth but during Aetius' episcopate he was accused and convicted of being a Gnostic, and was then deposed from the presbyterate—at some time he had been made a presbyter. After his conviction he was banished by Aetius and went to live in Arabia at Cocabe where the roots of the Ebionites and Nazoraeans were—as I have indicated of Cocabe in many Sects.

1,6 He returned later, however, as though having come to his senses with the approach of old age. But he was secretly carrying this poison within him and went unrecognized by everyone until finally, from things he had whispered to certain persons, he was exposed for what he was

[1] This Sect is based upon Epiph's experience and upon Gnostic sources, particularly on a work he calls *The Harmony*.

and anathematized and refuted by my poor self. (7) And after that he took up residence in the cave, abhorred by all and isolated from the brotherhood and from most who cared for their salvation.

1,8 This Eutactus—if, indeed, he was "orderly"—was entertained by this old man on his way home from Egypt, imbibed the old man's wicked doctrine and, receiving this poison as choice merchandise, brought it back to his own country. For as I said, he came from Lesser Armenia, near Satale. (9) On his return to his homeland, then, he polluted many there, in Lesser Armenia. For he had unfortunately become acquainted with certain rich men, with a woman of senatorial rank, and with other persons of distinction, and through these prominent people he ruined many of his countrymen. The Lord quickly removed him from the world, only he had sown his tare.

2,1 These people too have forged some apocrypha of their own, and these are their names. They call one book a "Lesser Harmony," if you please, and another a "Greater Harmony." They heap up certain other books, moreover, <and add these> to any they may light on, to give the appearance of confirming their own error through many sources. (2) And by now they also have the ones called the "Strangers"—there are books with this title.[2] And they take cues from the Ascension of Isaiah, and from still other apocrypha.

2,3 But everything <about their sect can be seen> from the book called the Harmony in which they say there is an ogdoad of heavens and a hebdomad, and that there are archons for each heaven. And certain belong to the seven heavens, one archon to one heaven, and there are bands (of angels) for each archon, and the shining Mother[3] is at the very top in the eighth heaven—like the other sects.

2,4 Some of them are defiled in body by licentiousness; but others make a show of pretended fasting, if you please, and deceive the simple by taking pride in some kind of ascetic discipline in the guise of hermits.[4] (5) And as I mentioned, they say that there is a principality and authority for every heaven and certain angelic servitors, since each archon has sired

---

[2] See p. 281 n. 14.

[3] See p. 100 n. 14.

[4] A comparable accusation might be implied by Gos. Jud. 40,7-16: After him another man will stand up from the [fornicators], and another [will] stand up from the slayers of children, and another from those who sleep with men and those who abstain (ⲛⲉⲧⲛⲏⲥⲧⲉⲩⲉ)…and those who say, "We are like angels".

and created his own retinue.[5] But there is no resurrection of the flesh, only of the soul.[6]

2,6 They execrate baptism, though there may be some who have previously been taken and baptized.[7] And they make light of participation in the mysteries, and of their goodness, as something that is foreign to them and has been instituted in the name of Sabaoth.[8] (Like certain other sects they hold that he is in the eighth heaven, ruling as an autocrat and lording it over the others.) (7) They say that the soul is the food of the principalities and authorities, and that they cannot live without it, since it is some of the ichor on high and affords them power.[9] (8) But if it has come into knowledge and avoided the baptism of the church and the name of Sabaoth the lawgiver it ascends heaven by heaven and offers its defense to each authority, and thus rises above them to the supernal Mother and the Father of all, the very place from which it descended into this world.

2,9 I have already said that they execrate baptism as "deadly flies, causing the preparation of the oil of sweetness to stink"[10]—as the parable is given by the Preacher, with reference to them and people of their kind. For they are truly flies which are deadly and death-dealing, and which spoil the aromatic oil of sweetness—God's holy mysteries which are granted us in baptism for the remission of sins.

3,1 But one might be surprised to find some things of great usefulness even in the naturalists if he emulates the bee in wisdom, which settles on every plant and gathers what is useful to it. (2) For the wise man never loses anywhere but profits by everything; but the unwise will incur loss as the holy prophet says, "Who is wise, and he shall understand these things? And

---

[5] Cf. Eug. 88,17-89,2.

[6] Note Treat. Res. 47,1-12: Therefore never doubt concerning resurrection . . . For if you were not existing in the flesh, you received flesh when you entered this world. Why will you not receive flesh when you ascend into the Aeon? That which is better than flesh, which is for it the cause of life, that which came into being on your account, is it not yours? Other passages which could be interpreted as teaching a "resurrection of the soul" are Test. Tr. 34,25-38,27; 44,3-7; Gos. Jud. 43,12-44,7; 53,16-26.

[7] Baptism is bitterly condemned at Para. Shem 37,19-38,27; Test. Tr. 69,7-22, and probably at Gos. Judas 55,21f though this text is fragmentary. See also the Marcosian objections to baptism which are mentioned at 34,20,9-12, p. 252. At the Mandaean *Ginza* 255,5-10 Christian baptism is called the "sign of (the fallen) Ruha."

[8] Gos. Jud. 34,6-11 states the same kind of objection to the eucharist. See also Gos. Jud. 56,11-13.

[9] Cf. Dia. Sav. 122,19; PS 1.26 (McDermot pp. 36-37); 1.27 (p. 39) et al.

[10] Eccles 10:1

who hath the word of the Lord, and he shall know them. For the ways of the Lord are straight, but the transgressors shall fail in them."[11]

3,3 For I find even in the so-called naturalists—or rather, I see for myself—that it is the nature of dung-beetles, which some call bylari, to roll in foulness and dung, and this is food and work for them. But to other insects this same filthy food of theirs <is plainly> offensive and evil-smelling. (4) For bees too, this dung and foul odor is death, while to dung-beetles it is work, nourishment, and an occupation. For bees, in contrast, fragrance, blossoms and perfumes serve as refreshment, an acquisition and food, and as work and an occupation. But such things are the reverse for the dung-beetles, or bylari.

3,5 Anyone who desires to test them, as the naturalists say, can cause the death of dung-beetles by taking a bit of perfume, I mean balsam or nard, and applying it to them. They die instantly because they cannot stand the sweet odor. (6) Thus these people too, with their desire for copulation, fornication and wickedness, set their hope on evil things, but if they come near the holy font and its sweet fragrance, they die blaspheming God and despising his sovereignty.

4,1 But I shall demolish them with one or two texts. Even though there are things called principalities and authorities, they have not been established apart from God, especially not in the heavens. (2) For scripture does know of "angels and archangels," not as ranged in opposition but as "ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation."[12]

4,3 Even on earth indeed there are many "authorities" in each kingdom, but under one king. "The powers that be are ordained of God," as the apostle says: "Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God, (4) since the rulers are not against the good, but for the good, and not against the truth, but for the truth. Wilt thou not be afraid of the power?" he says. "Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same. For he beareth not the sword in vain. For he is a minister ordained of God for this very thing, for him that doeth evil."[13] (5) And you see how this worldly authority has been appointed by God and has received the right of the sword, not from any other source but from God, for retribution. And we cannot say that because there are principalities

[11] Hos 3:2
[12] Heb 1:14
[13] Rom 13:1-4; 2 Cor 13:8

and authorities in the world, their king is not a king. The principalities and authorities exist, and so does their king.

4,6 We see on earth—it is plainly evident—that the principalities are not opposed to the king but set under him, for the administration of the whole kingdom and the good ordering of earth, where there are murders and wars, mistakes and instructions, instances of order and disorder. And authorities exist for this reason, the good ordering and disposition of all God's creatures in an orderly system for the governance of the whole world. (7) And so in heaven—but most especially there, where there is no envy, jealousy, disorder, contention, discord, conspiracy, robbery or anything else of this nature—authorities have been appointed for another task. (8) Which task do I mean but the repetition of the hymn, the unalloyed praise on high? On its account our bountiful God and king has willed to grant each of his creatures its proper glory, that the splendor, incomprehensibility and awesomeness of his kingdom may always be glorified. Plainly, then, those Archontics have gone wrong from not knowing the grace of God.

5,1 As I have mentioned already, they say the devil is the son of the seventh authority, that is, of Sabaoth. Sabaoth is God of the Jews and the devil is his wicked son, but is on earth to oppose his own father. (2) And his father is neither like him—nor, again, is he the incomprehensible God whom they call "Father," but he belongs to the left-hand authority.

5,3 People of their sort tell yet another myth, that the devil came to Eve, lay with her as a man with a women, and sired Cain and Abel by her. (4) That was why the one attacked the other—from their jealousy of each other and not, as the truth is, because Abel had somehow pleased God. Instead they concoct another story and <say>, "Because they were both in love with their own sister, Cain attacked Abel and killed him for this reason." For as I mentioned they say that they were actually of the devil's seed.

5,5 Whenever they want to fool someone they cite texts from the sacred books—I have mentioned this in another Sect as well—<to the effect that> the Savior said, "Ye are of Satan," to the Jews and, "Whensoever he speaketh a lie he speaketh of his own, for his father was a liar also."[14] (6) This allows them to say, if you please, that Cain was the <son> of the devil because the Savior said that the devil was a murderer from the beginning; and to say that the devil was <a liar because his father was a liar>, (7) to prove that Cain's father was the devil, and that the devil's

[14] John 8:44

father was the lying archon. The fools say, in blasphemy against their own head, that this is Sabaoth himself, (8) since they suppose that Sabaoth is a name for some god.

Already in the previous Sects I have dealt at length with the translation of Sabaoth and other names—Eli and Elohim, El and Shaddai, Elyon, Rabboni, Jah, Adonai and Jahveh—(9) since they are all to be translated as terms of praise, and are not as it were given names for the Godhead. Here too I hasten to give them in translation. (10) "El" means "God"; "Elohim," "God forever"; "Eli," "my God"; "Shaddai," "the Sufficient"; "Rabboni," "the Lord"; "Jah," "Lord"; "Adonai," "He who is existent Lord." "Jahveh" means, "He who was and is, He who forever is," as he translates for Moses, "'He who is' hath sent me, shalt thou say unto them."[15] "Elyon" is "highest." And "Sabaoth" means, "of hosts"; hence "Lord Sabaoth," means, "Lord of Hosts." (11) For wherever scripture uses the expression, "Sabaoth," <"Lord"> is put next to it. <Scripture> does not merely cry, "Sabaoth said to me," or, "Sabaoth spoke," but says immediately, "Lord Sabaoth." For the Hebrew says, "Adonai Sabaoth," which means "Lord of hosts."[16]

6,1 And it is in vain that they and people like themselves quibble, in the blindness of their minds, at things which have been rightly said. (2) There is nothing said about the devil in what the Savior said to the Jews, as is obvious to any follower of the truth; he said what he did to them on Judas' account. (3) They were no children of the Abraham who entertained him beneath the oak of Mamre before his incarnation. They condemned themselves to becoming sons of the treason of Judas who is called Satan and devil by the Lord, as he says, "Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?"[17] (4) And because of this, to show his evil nature, the Lord said, "Whensoever he speaketh a lie he speaketh of his own."[18] And the Gospel also says, in another passage, "He was a thief, and himself bare the bag."[19]

6,5 As his father, then, Judas, who was called "devil," had Cain, who deceived his brother Abel with a lie and killed him and also falsely said,"I know not,"[20] when he was asked by the Lord, "Where is Abel thy brother? (6) Suitably, then, he too, since he had mimicked the actual devil's behav-

---

[15] Exod 3:14
[16] Cf. Gos. Egyp. III,2 48,14-15: Adonaios who is called Sabaoth.
[17] John 6:70
[18] John 8:44
[19] John 12:6
[20] Gen 4:9

ior, was rightly designated his son by the Savior. For "Of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he also brought in bondage."[21] And each of us, whatever he does, will get as fathers the ones who have done it before him, by his imitation of them. (7) It has been clearly explained, then, that the Savior's saying, "Ye are children of the devil"—and again, "Whensoever he speaketh a lie he speaketh of his own, for his father was a liar"[22]—was a reference to Judas and Cain. (8) Accordingly, "For his father was a liar," referred to the devil himself, because of the deeds like his which were done by each of them. For in breathing into the serpent's mouth the devil has spoken all lies, and this is how he deceived Eve then.

6,9 And their erring mythology about these passages is discredited even though scripture says, "As Cain slew his brother, for he was of the devil."[23] It has been fully demonstrated that he was called the devil's son not, as they suppose, because of Eve's conceiving from the devil's seed as in conjugal intercourse and physical union and bearing Cain and Abel, but because of his similar character and his imitation of the devil's wickedness.

7,1 But again, the same people say that Adam had intercourse with his own wife, Eve, and sired Seth as his own actual son. And then, they say, the power on high came down with the ministering angels of the good God, (2) snatched Seth himself, whom they also call "Stranger," bore him aloft somewhere and nurtured him for some time so that he would not be killed.[24] And long afterwards it brought him back down to this world and made him spiritual, and yet physical <in appearance>, so that the <Demiurge>, and the other authorities and principalities of the god who made the world, would not prevail against him. (3) And they say he no longer worshiped the creator and demiurge, but recognized the ineffable power and the good God on high,[25] <and> that he worshiped him, and made many revelations about the maker of the world and its principalities and authorities.

7,4 <And so> they have also composed certain books in the name of Seth himself, saying that they have been given by him, and others in the

---

[21] 2 Pet 2:19

[22] John 8:44

[23] 1 John 3:12

[24] Cf. Irenaeus 1.31.11. Something comparable is said of Sabaoth at Nat. Arc.95,19-22; Orig. Wld. 104,17-22. In the Mandaean *Ginza* this is said of Shitil at 443,9-11, and of John the Baptist at *Johannesbuch* 116,13-19. Cf. also the disappearance of Judas into a shining cloud at Gos. Jud. 57,16-23.

[25] Sabaoth recognizes Pistis in this way and worships her at Or. Wld. 103,32-104,6. Adam recognizes "the likeness of his own foreknowledge and hence begets Seth at Apocry. Jn. II,1 23,35-25,2.

name of him[26] and his seven sons. (5) For they say he sired seven <sons> called "Strangers,"[27] as I have also said in other Sects, I mean The Gnostics and The Sethians.)

7,6 They say that there are other prophets too, a Martiades and a Marsianus, who were snatched up into the heavens and came down three days later.[28] (7) And there are many things which they make up and write down falsely, fabricating blasphemies against the true God the Almighty, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, as though he were an archon and an originator of evil—a thing of which they are convicted by their own words.

7,8 For if an originator of evils is also an evildoer how can it not be found at once that God is good, as I have said in the other Sects, since he legislated against fornication, adultery, rapine and covetousness? For they too say he is God of the Jews—but he gave the Jews the Law, in which he forbade all these things of which they call him the originator! And how can he be called Satan's father, when he has given so many warnings against Satan?

7,9 And suppose he is foreign to the God they call high, and is not God the Almighty himself—our King and Lord, <proclaimed> in Law, Prophets, Gospels and Apostles, himself God the[29] Lord, and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Why does the Lord himself plainly teach (that he is) in the Gospel, and say, "I thank thee, Father, *Lord of heaven and earth*" to show that his Father is God of all?

8,1 And again, to hint that there will be a resurrection of the dead, the Son of this God says, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up."[30] But by "temple" he meant his own body, which would be "destroyed" by the hands of men—that is, killed. (2) But something which was not a body but an apparition—as these people in their turn say[31]—could

---

[26] See p. 98 n. 34.

[27] Cf. Three Stel. 120-11-13: they are from other races, they are not similar. And see p. 281 n. 15.

[28] Cf. U 7 (MacDermot p. 235): The powers of all the great aeons have given homage to the power which is in Marsanes. They said, "Who is this who has been these things before his face, that he has thus revealed concerning him?" NHC X,l is entitled *Marsanes*. Marsanes is also mentioned at Eus. H. E. 6.12.

[29] Matt 11:25

[30] John 2:19

[31] For NHC examples of at least quasi-docetism, see 2 Apoc. Jas. 57,10-19; Gr. Seth 53,23-26; 55,16-56,19; 27-30; Apoc. Pet. 81,3-83,15; Melch. 5,2-11, however, polemicizes against docetism. See also Man. Ps. 191,4-8; 196,22-26 as well as the Acts of John 87-99 (H-S II pp. 179-180); 101-102 (pp. 185-186); Acts of Paul VII.1.14 (H-S II p. 254).

not have fallen into someone's hands and been raised the third day, as he promised. (3) By such a provision it is plainly proved that the resurrection of the dead is undeniable, and <that> the soul does not need a speech of defense to give before each authority—this too is a fabrication of theirs, as we have said—but needs the Lord's deed of lovingkindness, sustained by works and faith. (4) So says the most holy Paul, writing to Timothy with these words: "That thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of the Lord, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth,[32] which the many having deserted have turned unto fables and words of folly,[33] understanding neither what they say nor whereof they affirm,[34] of whom are Phygelus and Hermogenes."[35] (5) In his second epistle, moreover, he says that Hymenaeus and Philetus have gone wrong about the truth.[36] They were followers of this sect themselves, proclaiming another God and endless genealogies, (6) implanting fresh error in men by saying that the world was not made by God but by principalities and authorities, and that the resurrection has already come in the children who are begotten by each of their parents, but that there will be no resurrection of the dead. And see the character of the truth, brothers, and the refutation of their disorder!

8,7 But I suppose that enough has been said about these people too. I shall pass this sect by and make my way to the rest, saying only that, with the variety of its names for archons, this sect seems very like the tangled malignity of serpents. (8) For in a way the poisonous emission of their imposture has been taken at random from many snakes. It has the dragon's arrogance, for example, the treachery of the toad that inflates itself, the pull in the opposite direction of the gudgeon's breath, the pride of the quick-darting serpent, and calamine's uselessness. (9) But now that we have crushed the heads of all these with the statement of the truth, beloved, let us go on to the rest, and try by God's inspiration to disclose the error of each.

---

[32] 1 Tim 3:15
[33] 2 Tim 4:4
[34] 1 Tim 1:7
[35] 2 Tim 1:15
[36] Cf. 2 Tim 2:17

41.

Against Cerdonians.[1] *Number twenty-one, but forty-one of the series*

1,1 One Cerdo succeeds these and Heracleon—a member of the same school, who took his cue from Simon and Satornilus. He was an immigrant from Syria who came to Rome[2] and appeared there, utter wretch that he was, as his own scourge and the scourge of his followers.

1,2 For the human race is wretched when it leaves God's way and strays, and has perished by separating itself from God's calling. (3) The proverb of the dog attending to the reflection of <the food> it had in its mouth applies to people like these. Looking into a pond, and thinking that the reflection in the water was larger than the food in its mouth, it opened its mouth and lost the food it had. (4) So these people, who had found the way and yet wanted to get hold of the reflection which had been formed in their imaginations, not only lost the nourishment which God had, as it were, graciously placed in their mouths, but drew destruction upon themselves as well.

1,5 Cerdo, then, lived in the time of bishop Hyginus, the ninth in succession from the apostles James, Peter and Paul.[3] Since his doctrine partakes of the other heresiarchs' foolishness it appears to be the same, but with him it is different and takes the following form:

1,6 He too has proclaimed two first principles to the world, and two supposed gods, one good, and unknown to all, whom Cerdo has called the Father of Jesus—and one the demiurge, who is evil and knowable,[4] and has spoken in the Law and appeared to the prophets[5] and often become visible. (7) Christ is not born of Mary and has not appeared in flesh, but since he exists in appearance he has also been manifest in appearance, and done everything in appearance.[6] And Cerdo too rejects the resurrec-

---

[1] The sources of this Sect are Irenaeus (1.27.1) and Hipp. Synt. (PsT 6.1). Eus. H. E. 4.11.1-2 depends upon Irenaeus, as does Hipp. Refut. 10.19.1-4. Fil. 44 uses Hipp. Synt. Hipp. Refut. 10.19.1-4 treats of Cerdo and Marcion together and appears to have a different source.

[2] Eus. H. E. 4.11.1 and Fil. 46 mention Cerdo's Syrian origin.

[3] This date, and the notice of the succession, are found at Iren. 1.27.1; Eus. H. E. 4.11.1.

[4] This paragraph comes chiefly from Hipp. Synt.; see PsT 6.1: initia duo, id est duos deos etc. Iren. 1.27.1 furnishes hunc enim cognosci illum autem ignorari. PsT calls the creator saevum; Epiph, probably reflecting the original, πονηρόν; Fil 4.1, malum. Iren. and Hipp. Refut. 7.37.1 say δίκαιον/justum.

[5] PsT 6.1: Hic prophetias et legem repudiat.

[6] Cf. PsT. 6.1; Fil. 44.2.

tion of the flesh, and repudiates the Old Testament which was given by Moses and the prophets, as something foreign to God. (8) But Christ has come from on high, from the unknown Father, to put an end to the rule and tyranny of the world-creator and demiurge here, as many of the sects have declared of course. (9) After a short time in Rome he imparted his venom to Marcion, and Marcion thus became his successor.

2,1 Since this sect is just as detectible (as the last), my remarks about it will be brief. And once again, I shall begin the refutation of Cerdo from the very things he says. (2) For that there cannot be two first principles at once is obvious. Either the two principles are derived from some one; or the one is a second principle, while the other is the cause and principle of the second. So we shall need either to find a cause for the two or find which of them, being the principle of the other, <is its cause>, as I said. (3) And thus our minds must be led back by every route to the one, the principle which is found to be the first, the source either of the second or of both, as I have shown.

2,4 But the two first principles cannot possibly exist at once, nor can the one possibly differ from the other. For if they differ there are two of them; but by adding up to two they have become more than one. But since the one, first number is required, "two" are subordinate to the number which is "one" and prior, the cause of "two." (5) For the "two," which come after the number "one," or single, first principle, cannot be their own cause since the unit, which comes first of all, is always required.

2,6 For if it is apparent that the two are of one accord and mutually complaisant and harmonious, with one of them consenting to the permanence of the other and the other rejoicing in its partnership with the first, what conflict is there between the two of them? (7) But if they are in conflict, and each is equally as strong as the other, then, although Christ came to do away with the one, he cannot be capable of destroying its tyranny. It will stand its ground and have the ability to struggle with the invisible, unnameable power on high and hold out, and can never be destroyed.

3,1 The fool says that both the Law and the prophets belong to the inferior, contrary principle, but that Christ belongs to the good one. (2) Then why did the prophets make prophecies which typified Christ, unless the power that spoke in the Law, the prophets, and the Gospels was one and the same? As he says, "Lo, here am I that speak in the prophets," and so on. (3) And why did the Lord also, in the Gospel, <cry out>, "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me also, for he wrote of me?"[7]

[7] Luke 1:8

3,4 And I could say a great deal about proof-texts, just as Cerdo did to gather his own school when he sprouted up in the world at an evil juncture and led his dupes astray. (5) But I shall pass it by as well since I have destroyed it like a bembix or wasp—flying insects with stings, that suddenly take wing and dart at us—with God's self-evident faith, (6) with the saving teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ, who said, "See ye be not deceived, for many false prophets shall come in my name"; and with the teaching of the apostle, who spoke of these false Christs, false teachers and false brethren, and warned us against them. <And> proceeding to the rest in our series, I shall give the description of the others.

42.

Against Marcionites.[1] *Number twenty-two, but forty-two of the series*

1,1 Marcion, the founder of the Marcionites, taking his cue from Cerdo, appeared in the world as a great serpent himself and became the head of a school by deceiving a throng of people in many ways, even to this day. (2) The sect is still to be found even now, in Rome and Italy, Egypt and Palestine, Arabia and Syria, Cyprus and the Thebaid—in Persia too moreover, and in other places. For the evil one in him has lent a great deal of strength to the deceit.

1,3 He was a native of Pontus[2]—I mean of Helenopontus and the city of Sinope, as is commonly said of him. (4) In early life he supposedly practiced celibacy, for he was a hermit and the son of a bishop of our holy catholic church.[3] But in time he unfortunately became acquainted with a virgin, cheated the virgin of her hope and degraded both her and himself,[4] and for seducing her was excommunicated by his own father. (5) For because of his extreme piety his father was one of those illustrious

---

[1] This Sect follows the outline of Hipp. Synt., which is represented by PsT 6.2-3 and Fil. 45; it inserts data from Irenaeus. (Fil. may have used Epiph as well.) Epiph has also read Eusebius (H. E. 4.11.1; 5.13.1-4) and his data about Marcion's "gods" may be based on a faulty memory of this author. Reproduced is Epiph's own treatise on Marcion's canon, from which he gives a number of quotations. Epiph takes reports of Marcion's and Cerdo's teachings as interchangeable, since he regards the latter as Marcion's master.

The earliest mention of Marcion is found at Justin Apol. 1.26.5. Tertulllian's long treatise *Adversus Marcionem* utilizes, among its other sources, some of Marcion's own writings. The source of Hipp. Refut. 7.27.1;30 is not obvious.

[2] Cf. Justin. Apol. 26.5; Iren. 1.27.2; Hipp. Refut. 7.29.1; 10.19.1 Pst 6.2; Fil. 45.1; Eus. H. E. 5.13.4 (where Marcion is called ὁ λύκος Πόντικος); Tert. Adv. Marc. 1.1.4; 3.6.3.

[3] PsT 6.2

[4] PsT 6.2. The same sort of thing is said of Apelles at Tert. Praescr. 30.

men who take great care of the church, and was exemplary in the exercise of his episcopal office. (6) Though Marcion begged and pleaded many times, if you please, for penance, he could not obtain it from his own father. For the distinguished old bishop was distressed not only because Marcion had fallen, but because he was bringing the disgrace on him as well.

1,7 As Marcion could not get what he wanted from him by fawning, unable to bear the scorn of the populace he fled his city and arrived at Rome itself after the death of Hyginus, the bishop of Rome. (Hyginus was ninth in succession from the apostles Peter and Paul). Meeting the elders[5] who were still alive and had been taught by the disciples of the apostles, he asked for admission to communion, and no one would grant it to him. (8) Finally, seized with jealousy since he could not obtain high rank besides entry into the church, he reflected and took refuge in the sect of that fraud, Cerdo.

2,1 And he began—at the very beginning, as it were, and as though at the starting-point of the questions at issue—to put this question to the elders of that time: "Tell me, what is the meaning of, 'Men do not put new wine into old bottles, or a patch of new cloth unto an old garment; else it both taketh away the fullness, and agreeth not with the old. For a greater rent will be made'"?[6]

2,2 On hearing this the good and most sacred elders and teachers of God's holy church gave him the appropriate and fitting answer, and equably explained, (3) "Child, 'old bottles' means the hearts of the Pharisees and scribes, which had grown old in sins and not received the proclamation of the gospel. (4) And 'the old garment' received a 'worse rent' just as Judas received a further rent through his own fault and no one else's because,al though he had been associated with the eleven apostles and called by the Lord himself, he had grown old in greed and had not received the new, holy, heavenly mystery's message of hope. (5) For his mind was not in tune with the high hope and heavenly call of the good things to come, in place of worldly wealth and vanity, and the love of passing hope and pleasure."

2,6 "No," Marcion retorted, "there are other explanations besides these."

<And> since they were unwilling to receive him, he asked them plainly, "Why will you not receive me?"

---

[5] Fil. 45.1: Urbem Roman devenit, ibique degens sceleratam heresin seminabat, atque interrogans presbyteros sanctae catholicae ecclesiae…

[6] Matt. 9:16-17; Luke 5:36. PsT 6.2 makes Marcion cite Matt. 7:17. Fil. 45.2 gives both citations, opening the possibility that this author knew Epiph as well as Hipp. Synt. Matt. 7:17 is referred to at Hipp. Refut. 10.19.3 and at Tert. Adv. Marc. 3.15.5; 4.11.10.

2,7 "We cannot without your worthy father's permission," was their answer. There is one faith and one concord, and we cannot oppose our excellent colleague, your father.

2,8 Becoming jealous then and roused to great anger and arrogance Marcion made the rent, founding his own sect and saying, "I am going to tear your church, and make a rent in it forever." He did indeed make a rent of no small proportions, not by rending the church but by rending himself and his converts.

3,1 But he took his cue from that charlatan and swindler, Cerdo.[7] For he too preaches two first principles. But adding something to him, I mean to Cerdo, he exhibits something different in his turn by saying that there are three principles.[8] One is the unnameable, invisible one on high which he likes to call a "good God,"[9] but which has made none of the things in the world.[10] (2) Another is a visible God, a creator and demiurge.[11] But the devil is as it were a third god and in between these two, the visible and the invisible.[12] The creator, demiurge and visible God is the God of the Jews, and he is a judge.[13]

3,3 Celibacy[14] too is preached by Marcion himself, and he preaches fasting on the Sabbath. Marcionite supposed mysteries are celebrated in front of the catechumens.[15] He uses water in the mysteries.

3,4 He claims that we should fast on the Sabbath for the following reason: "Since it is the rest of the God of the Jews who made the world

---

[7] Fil. 45.3: Deque hoc accipiens interpretationem a sanctis presbyteris non acquiescebat veritati sed magis Cerdonis sui doctoris firmabat mendacium. Cf. Eus. H. E. 4.11.2.

[8] From Eus. H. E. 5.13.4: ἄλλοι…οὐ μόνον δύο ἀλλὰ καὶ τρεῖς ὑποτίθεντα φύσει, ὧν ἔστιν ἀρχηγὸς καὶ προστάτης Σύνερως. Epiph has forgotten the attribution to Syneros. PsT 6.1-2 and Iren 1.27.2 attribute the doctrine of two Gods to Cerdo as does Tert. Adv. Marc. *passim*. Hipp. Refut. 7.31.1-2 ascribes the doctrine of two Gods to Marcion, and of three to the Marcionite teacher Prepon. See also Adam 1.2.

[9] At Hipp. Refut. 10.19.1-2 the "principles "are ἀγαθόν, δίκαιον, ὕλην or ἀγαθόν, δίκαιον, πονηρόν, ὕλην. PsT 6.1, as of Cerdo, says unum bonum, alterum saevum. Fil. 46, also as of Cerdo, gives: unum bonum et unum malum annuntians.

[10] Cf. Iren. 1.27.2; PsT 6.1; Hipp. Refut. 10.19.1.

[11] Iren. 1.27.2: quem et Cosmocratorem dicit; Hipp. Refut. 30.3.4: δημιουργόν.

[12] None of Epiph's sources speak of the devil as god. Epiph may be extrapolating from the πονηρός/saevus of Hipp. Refut. 10.19.1/PsT 6.1. For a god intermediate (μέσον) between the two others see Hipp. Refut. 7.31.2, where the idea is ascribed to one Prepon, and Ptolemy's Epistle to Flora at Pan. 42,7,4.

[13] That is, "just." Iren. 1.27.1; Eus. H. E. 4.17.2; Hipp. Refut. 7.31.2, and see Pan. 42.7.4.

[14] Hipp. Refut. 7.30.3-4; 10.19.4; Clem. Strom. 3.3.12.1-2; 4.25.1-2; Tert. Adv. Marc. 1.29.1. Epiph, however, contradicts this at 43,1,5.

[15] Tert. Praescr. 41.1-2, although Tertullian does not specify Marcionites.

and rested the seventh day, let us fast on this day, so as to do nothing congenial to the God of the Jews,"[16] (5) He denies the resurrection of the flesh like many of the sects; he says that resurrection, life and salvation are of the soul only.[17]

3,6 Marcionite baptism is not administered just once; in Marcionite congregations it is allowable to give up to three baptisms and more to anyone who wishes, as I have heard from many. (7) But he got into this way of allowing the giving of three baptisms and even more because of the scorn he suffered from his disciples who had known him, for his transgression and the seduction of the virgin. (8) Since he was in a state of grievous sin after seducing the virgin in his own city and fleeing, the tramp invented a second baptism for himself. He said that it is permissible for as many as three baths, that is baptisms, to be given for the remission of sins, so that if one were to fall away the first time he might repent and, on repentance, receive a second baptism—and a third likewise, if he transgresses after the second.

3,9 But to make his ridicule certain he mendaciously cites a text as supposedly persuasive, to show that he was cleansed again after his transgression and thereafter counts as innocent—a text that can be deceptive, but does not mean what he says it does: (10) after the Lord had been baptized by John he told his disciples, "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and why do I wish it if I have already accomplished it?"[18] And again, "I have a cup to drink, and why do I wish to if I am going to fill it?"[19] And so he held that several baptisms may be administered.

4,1 But this is not all. He rejects both the Law and all the prophets,[20] and says that the prophets have prophesied by the inspiration of the archon who made the world. (2) And he says that Christ has descended from on high, from the invisible Father who cannot be named, for the salvation of souls and the confusion of the God of the Jews, the Law, the prophets, and anything of the kind. (3) The Lord has gone down even to Hades to save Cain, Korah, Dathan, Abiram, Esau, and all the gentiles who had not known the God of the Jews. (4) But he has left Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, David, and Solomon there because, as he

---

[16] Cf. Tertullian's discussion at Adv. Marc. 4.12.

[17] Iren. 1.27.3; PsT 6.1; Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.10.15; Res. Mort. 2; Adam. 7; Gos. Phil. 56,26-57,22; Treat. Res. 47,30-48.2 and see p. 00 n. 00.

[18] Luke 12:50

[19] Iren. 1.27.1; Eus. H. E. 4.11.2; PsT 6.1; Tert. Adv. Marc. 1.19.4; 4.34.15

[20] Tert. Adv. Marc. 1.19; 4.34

says, they recognized the God of the Jews, the maker and creator, and have done what is congenial to him, and did not devote themselves to the invisible God.[21]

4,5 They even permit women to administer baptism! For, given that they even venture to celebrate the mysteries in front of catechumens, everything they do is simply ridiculous.[22] (6) As I indicated, Marcion says resurrection is not of bodies but of souls, and he assigns salvation to these and not to bodies. And he similarly claims that there are reincarnations of souls, and transmigrations from body to body.

5,1 But his futile nonsense fails in every respect, as I have already argued in other Sects. How can the soul, which has not fallen, rise? How can we speak of its resurrection, the resurrection of the soul which has not fallen? Whatever falls needs an arising (2) but a soul does not fall, a body does. Hence common usage is correct in calling the body a "carcass" and so is the Lord himself, who said, "Wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together."[23]

5,3 For we do not shut souls up in tombs. We deposit bodies in the ground and cover them up, and as a hope their resurrection is preached, like the resurrection of a grain of wheat. (4) The holy apostle has borne his witness as to the grain of wheat and other seeds and so has the Lord himself in the Gospel, "Except a corn of wheat fall and die, it abideth alone."[24] (5) But the holy apostle says, "Thou fool!" (For he is calling "fool" the unbeliever who is completely in doubt and asks, "How can the resurrection be, with what body do they come?" And to such he says immediately, "Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die.")[25] (6) And the scripture has shown at every point that there is a resurrection of the grain which has fallen, that is of the body which is buried, and not of the soul. (7) And how can the soul come by itself? How can it reign by itself, when it did good or evil together with a body? The judgment will not be just, but the reverse!

6,1[26] And how can Marcion's own tally of three principles be substantiated? How can <the one which> does work—either the work of salvation, or the other kinds—in the bad god's territory be considered "good"? (2) For

---

[21] Iren. 1.27.3
[22] Tert. Praescr. 41.5
[23] Matt. 24:28
[24] John 12:24
[25] 1 Cor 15:35-36
[26] The argument developed from here through 7,9 is based in part on Iren. 2.1.2-5.

suppose the world does not belong to him, and yet he sent his Only-begotten into the world to take things from someone else's world, which he neither begot nor made—it will be found, either that he is invading someone else's domain or that, being poor and having nothing of his own, he is advancing against another person's territory to procure things which he does not already have.

6,3 And how can the demiurge act as judge between both parties? Whom can he judge, then? If he presides as judge over the articles which have been taken from the God on high, he is more powerful than the God on high—seeing that he hales the possessions of the God on high into his court, or so Marcion thought.

6,4 And if he is a judge at all, he is just. But from the word, "just," I shall show that goodness and justice are the same thing. Anything that is just is also good. (5) It is because of his being good that, with impartial justice, God grants what is good to one who has done good. And he cannot be opposed to the good God in point of goodness, since he provides the good with good on the principle of justice, and the bad with the penalty of retribution.

6,6 Nor, again, can he be good if he gives the good reward to the unrepentantly evil at the end, even though for now he makes his sun rise on good and evil men and provides them with his rain, because of their freedom of choice at this present. (7) The nature of a God who provides the evil with the reward of salvation in the world to come, and does not rather hate what is wicked and evil, cannot be good and just.

6,8 But as to Marcion's third, evil god. If he has the power to do evil things and master either the denizens of the world who belong to the God on high or the ones who belong to the intermediate, just God—then this god must be stronger than the two whom Marcion calls Gods, since he has the power to seize what is not his. (9) And then the two will be adjudged weaker than the one evil god, since they are powerless to resist and rescue their possessions from the one who is seizing them and turning them into evil.

7,1 And to realize what a joke the tramp's nonsense is, let us observe it again in another light. If the evil god is at all evil, and yet he seizes the good men from the good God and the just ones from the just God and does not seize only his own, then the evil god will turn out not to be evil—desiring the good and claiming them at law, because they are better. (2) And if, besides, he judges his own and exacts a penalty from wrongdoers, this judge of evil men cannot be evil after all. And Marcion's thesis will turn out to be self-refuting in every way.

7,3 But again, tell me, how did the three principles come to be? And who was it that set a boundary for them? If each is enclosed in its own space, then these three, which are enclosed in certain places that contain them, cannot be considered perfect. The thing that contains each one must be greater than the thing that is contained. And the thing that is contained can no longer be called "God" but rather, the boundary which contains it must (be so called).[27]

7,4 But even if, when they met, each one was allotted its own place by concession and, being in its own place, no principle crowds or encroaches on another, the principles cannot be opposed to each other, and none of them can be considered evil. They mind their own business in a just, calm and tranquil fashion, and do not try to overstep.[28]

7,5 But if the evil god is overpowered, coerced and oppressed by the God on high although he has received his allotment and is in his own place, and no part of this place belongs to the God on high nor has anything here, I mean in the evil god's territory, been created by him—the God on high will turn out to be the more tyrannical, certainly not "good," since he sent his own Son, or Christ, to take what belonged to someone else.

7,6 And where is the boundary which, according to the tramp's statement of his thesis, separates the three first principles? We shall need a fourth of some kind, abler and wiser than the three and an expert surveyor, who assigned its limits to each and made peace between the three, so that they would not quarrel or send anyone into each other's realms.[29] (7) And this person who convinced the three principles will be found to be a fourth—both wiser and abler than the others. And he too, once more, must be sought in his own place, from which he came to intervene between the three and wisely assign its portion to each, so that they would not wrong each other.

7,8 But if the two principles are resident in the realm of the one, that is, the realm of the demiurge, with the evil one <always active> in his territories and the good God's Christ a visitor there, then the judge will turn out not be only a demiurge and a judge, but good as well, since he permits the two to do what they please in his domain. Or else we shall find that he is feeble and unable to stop the alien robbers of his possessions.

7,9 But if he is even inferior in power, then his creation cannot exist, but would have given out long ago—carried off every day to his own realm

---

[27] See Iren. 2.1.2-3.
[28] See Iren. 2.1.5.
[29] Irenaeus says this of a "third" at 2.1.3.

by the evil god, and to the realms on high by the good one. And how can the creation still stand? (10) But if you say that it will come to an end eventually, and that it is possible for it to come to a complete end through the attentions of the good God, then will not the good God be responsible for the damage? Yet he never created that which he later saw fit to perfect, and he was certainly not its original maker, before most men were wronged, found themselves detained by the judge, and (so) have remained below.

8,1 But again, he cites sacred scripture without understanding it properly, and deceives the innocent by perverting the letter of the apostle's, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us."[30] He says, "If we were his, he would not 'buy' what was his own. (2) He entered someone else's world as a 'buyer' to redeem us, since we were not his. For we were someone else's creation, and he therefore 'bought' us at the price of his own life."

8,3 The fool has no notion that Christ has not become a curse either—perish the thought!—but has lifted the curse our sin had brought upon us by crucifying himself and becoming himself the death of death and a curse on the curse. Thus Christ is not a curse but a lifting of the curse, and a blessing to all who truly believe in him.

8,4 And "redeemed" <must> also <be understood> in this sense. Paul did not say "bought", and Christ did not enter foreign territory to plunder or buy. If he had bought he would have bought because he did not own and, like a beggar, would have acquired what he did not have. (5) And if our owner had sold us, he would have sold in desperation, and thus been under pressure from some moneylender. But this is not the case; for Paul did not say "bought," but "redeemed."

8,6 This same holy apostle says something similar to this, "redeeming the time, because the days are evil."[31] And we do not buy days, or pay for days; he said this meaning the <constancy which is attained through patient endurance>, and the patience of longsuffering. (7) Thus the word "redeemed" suggested the reason for his acceptance of an incarnation in the world, an incarnation where<by>, though the impassible God, he undertook to suffer for us, remaining in the impassibility which is proper to his Godhead and yet <reckoning as his own> the very thing that he had undertaken to suffer for us—not buying us from foreigners but accepting the affair of the cross for our sakes, by choice and not of necessity. (8) Hence

[30] Gal 3:13
[31] Eph. 5:16

Marcion's assertions stand refuted at every point. And there are many arguments in rebuttal of his stage-machinery and melodrama, which, contrary to him, are drawn from pious reason and creditable exposition.

9,1 But I shall come to his writings, or rather, to his tamperings. This man has only Luke as a Gospel, mutilated at the beginning because of the Savior's conception and his incarnation.[32] (2) But this person who harmed himself <rather> than the Gospel did not cut just the beginning off. He also cut off many words of the truth both at the end and in the middle, and he has added other things besides, beyond what had been written. And he uses only this (Gospel) canon, the Gospel according to Luke.

9,3 He also possesses ten Epistles of the holy apostle, the only ones he uses, but not all that is written in them. He deletes some parts of them, and has altered certain sections. He uses these two volumes (of the Bible) but has composed other treatises himself for the persons he has deceived.

9,4 Here are what he calls Epistles: 1. Galatians. 2. Corinthians. 3. Second Corinthians. 4. Romans. 5. Thessalonians. 6. Second Thessalonians. 7. Ephesians. 8. Colossians. 9. Philemon. 10. Philippians. He also has parts of the so-called Epistle to the Laodiceans.

9,5 From the very canon that he retains, of the Gospel and the Pauline Epistles, I can show with God's help that Marcion is a fraud and in error, and can refute him very effectively. (6) For he will be refuted from the very works which he acknowledges without dispute.[33] From the very remnants of the Gospel and Epistles which he still has, it will be demonstrated to the wise that Christ is not foreign to the Old Testament, and hence that the prophets are not foreign to the Lord's advent—(7) <and> that the apostle preaches the resurrection of the flesh and terms the prophets righteous, and Abraham, Isaac and Jacob among the recipients of salvation—and that all the teachings of God's holy church are saving, holy, and firmly founded by God on faith, knowledge, hope and doctrine.

10,1 I am also going to append the treatise which I had written against him before, a your instance, brothers, hastening to compose this one. (2) Some years ago, to find what falsehood this Marcion had invented and what his silly teaching was, I took up his very books which he had <mutilated>, his so-called Gospel and Apostolic Canon. From these two books I made a series of <extracts> and selections of the material which would serve to refute him, and I wrote a sort of outline for a treatise, arranging the

---

[32] Iren. 1.27.2; PsT 6.2; Fil. 45.5; Adam. 2.3; 19

[33] Iren. promises to do the same at 1.27.4 though his treatise, if he wrote it, does not survive. See also Book 4 of Tert. Adv. Marc.

points in order, and numbering each saying one, two, three (and so on). (3) And in this way I went through all of the passages in which it is apparent that, foolishly, he still retains against himself these leftover sayings of the Savior and the apostle.

10,4 For some of them had been falsely entered by himself, in an altered form and unlike the authentic copy of the Gospel and the meaning of the apostolic canon. (5) But others were exactly like both the Gospel and Apostle, unchanged by Marcion but capable of completely demolishing him. By these it is shown that <the> Old Testament is in agreement with the New, and the New with the Old. (6) In turn, other sayings from the same books give intimation that Christ has come in the flesh and been made perfect man among us. (7) Others in turn, moreover, confess the resurrection of the dead, and that God is one almighty Lord of all, himself the maker of heaven and earth, and of everything on earth. They do not counterfeit the call of the Gospel nor, certainly, do they deny the maker and artificer of all, but make manifest the One who is plainly confessed by the Apostolic Canon and the Proclamation of the Gospel. (8) And here, below, is my treatise, as follows:

Preface to the Publication concerning Marcion's Bible and the Refutation of It

11,1 Whoever cares to understand the phony inventions of the deceiver Marcion thoroughly and perceive the false contrivances of this victim (of the devil), should not hesitate to read this compilation. (2) I hasten to present the material from his own Gospel which is contradictory to his villainous tampering, so that those who are willing to read the work may have this as a training-ground in acuity, for the refutation of the strange doctrines of his invention.

11,3 For the (Marcionite) canon of Luke is revelatory of <their form of the Gospel>: mutilated as it is, without beginning, middle or end, it looks like a cloak full of moth holes.

11,4 At the very beginning he excised everything Luke had originally composed—his "inasmuch as many have taken in hand," and so forth, and the material about Elizabeth and the angel's announcement to Mary the Virgin; about John and Zacharias and the birth at Bethlehem; the genealogy and the story of the baptism. (5). All this he cut out and turned his back on, and made this the beginning of the Gospel, "In the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar," and so on.

11,6 He starts from there then and yet, again, does not go on in order. He falsifies some things, as I said, he adds others helter-skelter, not going straight on but disingenuously wandering all over the material. Thus:

1. "Go shew thyself unto the priest, and offer for thy cleansing, according as Moses commanded—that this may be a testimony unto you,"[34] instead of the Savior's "for a testimony unto them."

2. "But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power to forgive sins upon earth."[35]

3. "The Son of Man is lord also of the Sabbath."[36]

4. "Judas Iscariot, which was a betrayer." Instead of, "He came down with them," he has, "He came down among them."[37]

5. "And the whole multitude sought to touch him. And he lifted up his eyes,"[38] and so forth.

6. "In the like manner did your fathers unto the prophets."[39]

7. "I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel."[40]

8. "Blessed is he who shall not be offended in me,"[41] is altered. For he had it as though it refers to John.

9. "He it is of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face."[42]

10. "And entering into the Pharisee's house he reclined at table. And the woman which was a sinner, standing at his feet behind him, washed his feet with her tears, and wiped and kissed them."[43]

11. And again, "She hath washed my feet with her tears, and wiped and kissed them."[44]

12. He did not have, "His mother and his brethren," but only, "Thy mother and thy brethren."[45]

13. "As they sailed he fell asleep. Then he arose and rebuked the wind and the sea."[46]

14. "And it came to pass as they went the people thronged him, and a woman touched him, and was healed of her blood. And the Lord said,

---

[34] Luke 5:14. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.9.9-10.
[35] Luke 5:24
[36] Luke 6:5
[37] Luke 6:16-17
[38] Luke 6:19-20
[39] Luke 6:23
[40] Luke 7:9. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.18.1.
[41] Luke 7:23
[42] Luke 7:27. Cf. Adam. 2.18; Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.18.7
[43] Luke 7:36-38
[44] Luke 7:44-45
[45] Luke 8:19-20
[46] Luke 8:23-24

Who touched me?" And again, "Someone hath touched me; for I perceive that virtue hath gone out of me."[47]

15. "Looking up to heaven he pronounced a blessing upon them."[48]

16. "Saying, The Son of Man must suffer many things, and be slain, and be raised after three days."[49]

17. "And, behold, there were talking with him two men, Elijah and Moses in glory."[50]

18. "Out of the cloud, a voice, This is my beloved Son."[51]

19. "I besought thy disciples." But in addition to, "And they could not cast it out," he had, "And he said to them, O faithless generation, how long shall I suffer you?"[52]

20. "For the Son of Man shall be delivered into the hands of men."[53]

21. "Have ye not read so much as this, what David did: he went into the house of God."[54]

22. "I thank thee, Lord of heaven."[55] But he did not have, "and earth," nor did he have, "Father." He is shown up, however; for further down he had, "Even so, Father."

23. He said to the lawyer, "What is written in the Law?" And after the lawyer's answer he replied, "Thou hast answered right; this do, and thou shalt live."[56]

24. And he said, "Which of you shall have a friend, and shall go unto him at midnight, asking three loaves?" And then, "Ask, and it shall be given. If a son shall ask a fish any of you that is a father, will he for a fish give him a serpent, or a scorpion for an *egg*? If, then, ye evil men know of good gifts, how much more the Father?"[57]

25. The saying about Jonah the prophet has been gutted; Marcion had, "This generation, no sign shall be given it." But he did not have anything about Nineveh, the queen of the south, and Solomon.[58]

---

[47] Luke 8:42-46. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.20.7-8.
[48] Luke 9:16
[49] Luke 9:22. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.21.7.
[50] Luke 9:30-31. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.22.1;16.
[51] Luke 9:35. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.22.1.
[52] Luke 9:40-41. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.23.1.
[53] Luke 9:44
[54] Luke 6:3-4. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.12.5.
[55] Luke 10:21. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.25.1.
[56] Luke 10:26-28.
[57] Luke 11:5; 9-13. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.26.28.
[58] Luke 11:29-32

26. Instead of, "Ye pass over the judgment of God,"[59] he had, "Ye pass over the calling of God."

27. "Woe unto you, for ye build the sepulchres of the prophets, and your fathers killed them."[60]

28. He did not have, "Therefore said the wisdom of God, I send unto them prophets," and the statement that the blood of Zacharias, Abel and the prophets will be required of this generation.[61]

29. "I say unto my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body. Fear him which, after he hath killed, hath authority to cast into hell." But he did not have, "Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings, and not one of them is forgotten before God?"

30. Instead of, "He shall confess before the angels of God,"[62] Marcion says, "before God."

31. He does not have, "God doth clothe the grass."[63]

32. "And your Father knoweth ye have need of these things,"[64] physical things, of course.

33. "But seek ye the kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you."[65]

34. Instead of, "Your Father," Marcion had, "Father."[66]

35. Instead of, "In the second or third watch," he had, "in the evening watch."[67]

36. "The Lord of that servant will come and will cut him in sunder, and will appoint his portion with the unbelievers."[68]

37. "Lest he hale thee to the judge and the judge deliver thee to the officer."[69]

38. There is a falsification from "There came some that told him of the Galilaeans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices" down to the place where he speaks of the eighteen who died in the tower at Siloam; and of "Except ye repent" <and the rest> until the parable of the fig tree

---

[59] Luke 11:42. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.27.4.
[60] Luke 11:47. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.27.8.
[61] Luke 11:49-51
[62] Luke 12:8. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.28.4.
[63] Luke 12:28.
[64] Luke 12:30. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.29.3.
[65] Luke 12:31. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.29.5
[66] Luke 12:32
[67] Luke 12:38
[68] Luke 12:46. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.29.9.
[69] Luke 12:58. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.29.16.

of which the cultivator said, "I am digging about it and dunging it, and if it bear no fruit, cut it down."[70]

39. "This daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound."[71]

40. Again, he falsified, "Then ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God." In place of this he put, "When ye see all the righteous in the kingdom of God and yourselves thrust"—but he put, "kept"—"out." "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."[72]

41. Again, he falsified, "They shall come from the east and from the west, and shall sit down in the kingdom," "The last shall be first," and "The Pharisees came saying, Get thee out and depart, for Herod will kill thee"; also, "He said, Go ye, and tell that fox," until the words, "It cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem," and, "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent, Often would I have gathered, as a hen, thy children," "Your house is left unto you desolate," and, "Ye shall not see me until ye shall say, Blessed."[73]

42. Again, he falsified the entire parable of the two sons, the one who took his share of the property and spent it in dissipation, and the other.[74]

43. "The Law and the prophets were until John, and every man presseth into it."[75]

44. The story of the rich man, and that Lazarus the beggar was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom.[76]

45. "But now he is comforted,"[77] again meaning this same Lazarus.

46. Abraham said, "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them, since neither will they hear him that is risen from the dead."[78]

47. He falsified, "Say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do."[79]

48. When the ten lepers met him. Marcion excised a great deal and wrote, "He sent them away, saying, Show yourselves unto the priests"; and he substituted different words for others and said, "Many lepers were in

---

[70] Luke 13:1-9
[71] Luke 13:16
[72] Luke 13:28. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.30.5.
[73] Luke 13:29-35
[74] Luke 15:11-32
[75] Luke 16:16. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.33.7.
[76] Luke 16:22. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.34.10; cf. Adam. 2.10.
[77] Luke 16:25. Cf. Adam. 2.10.
[78] Luke 16:29; 31. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.34.10; cf. Adam. 2.10.
[79] Luke 17:10

the day of Elisha the prophet, and none was cleansed, saving Naaman the Syrian."[80]

49. "The days will come when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of Man."[81]

50. "One said unto him, Good master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? He replied, Call not thou me good. One is good, God." Marcion added, "the Father," and instead of, "Thou knowest the commandments," says, "I know the commandments."[82]

51. "And it came to pass that as he was come nigh unto Jericho, a blind man cried, Jesus, thou Son of David, have mercy on me. And when he was healed, he said, Thy faith hath saved thee."[83]

52. Marcion falsified, "He took unto him the twelve, and said, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written in the prophets concerning the Son of Man shall be accomplished. For he shall be delivered and killed, and the third day he shall rise again"[84] He falsified the whole of this.

53. He falsified the passage about the ass and Bethphage, and the one about the city and the temple, because of the scripture, "My house shall be called an house of prayer, but ye make it a den of thieves."[85]

54. "And they sought to lay hands on him and they were afraid."[86]

55. Again, he excised the material about the vineyard which was let out to husbandmen, and the verse, "What is this, then, The stone which the builders rejected?"[87]

56. He excised, "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, in calling the Lord the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob. But he is a God of the living, not of the dead."[88]

57. He did not have the following: "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed, saying that the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob is God of the living."[89]

---

[80] Luke 17:12; 14; 4:27. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.35.4; 6.
[81] Luke 17:22
[82] Luke 18:18-20. Cf. Hipp. Refut. 7.31.6; Adam. 2.17; Orig. De Princ. 2.5.1; 5.4; Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.36.4.
[83] Luke 18:35; 38; 42. Cf. Adam. 4.14; Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.36.9-10.
[84] Luke 18:31-33
[85] Luke 19:29-46
[86] Luke 20:19
[87] Luke 20:9-17
[88] Luke 20:37-38
[89] Luke 20:37-38

58. Again he falsified, "There shall not an hair of your head perish."[90]

59. Again, he falsified the following: "Then let them which are in Judaea flee to the mountains," and so on, because of the words subjoined in the text, "until all things that are written be fulfilled."[91]

60. "He communed with the captains how he might deliver him unto them."[92]

61. "And he said unto Peter and the rest, Go and prepare that we may eat the passover."[93]

62. "And he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him, and he said, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer."[94]

63. He falsified, "I will not any more eat thereof until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God."[95]

64. He falsified "When I sent you, lacked ye anything," and so on, because of the words, "This also that is written must be accomplished, And he was numbered among the transgressors."[96]

65. "He was withdrawn from them about a stone's cast, and kneeled down, and prayed."[97]

66. "And Judas drew near to kiss him, and said…"[98]

67. He falsified what Peter did when he struck the servant of the high priest and cut off his ear.[99]

68. "They that held him mocked him, smiting and striking him and saying, Prophesy, who is it that smote thee?"[100]

69. After, "We found this fellow perverting the nation," Marcion added, "and destroying the Law and the prophets."[101]

70. The addition after "forbidding to give tribute" is "and turning away the wives and children."[102]

71. "And when they were come unto a place called Place of a Skull they crucified him and parted his garments, and the sun was darkened."[103]

---

[90] Luke 21:18
[91] Luke 21:21-22
[92] Luke 22:4
[93] Luke 22:8
[94] Luke 22:14-15. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.40.1.
[95] Luke 22:16
[96] Luke 22:35; 37
[97] Luke 22:41
[98] Luke 22:47-48
[99] Luke 22:50
[100] Luke 22:63-64
[101] Luke 23:2
[102] Luke 22:47-48
[103] Luke 23:33; 34; 44. Cf. Matt 24:29; Mark 13:24; Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.42.4-5.

72. Marcion falsified the words, "Today thou shalt be with me in paradise."[104]

73. "And when he had cried with a loud voice he gave up the ghost."[105]

74. "And, lo, a man named Joseph took the body down, wrapped it in linen and laid it in a sepulchre that was hewn out of the rock."[106]

75. "And the women returned and rested the sabbath day according to the Law."[107]

76. "The men in shining garments said, Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is risen; remember all that he spake when he was yet with you, that the Son of Man must suffer and be delivered."[108]

77. He falsified what Christ said to Cleopas and the other when he met them, "O fools, and slow to believe all that the prophets have spoken: Ought not he to have suffered these things?" And instead of, "what the prophets have spoken," he put, "what I said unto you." But he is shown up since, "When he broke the bread their eyes were opened and they knew him."[109]

78. "Why are ye troubled? Behold my hands and my feet, for a spirit hath not bones, as ye see me have."[110]

11,7 And in further opposition to this heresiarch I also attach, to this arrangement (of texts) which has been laboriously accumulated against him by myself, such other texts as I find in his works, as in an arbitrary version of the apostle Paul's epistles; not all of them but some of them—(I have listed their names in the order of his Apostolic Canon at the end of the complete work)—and these mutilated as usual by his rascality. (8) <(They are) remains of the truth which he preserves> as, to be honest, <there are> remains of the true Gospel in his Gospel in name which I have given above. All the same, he has adulterated everything with fearful ingenuity.

From the Epistle to the Romans, number four in Marcion's canon but number one in the Apostolic Canon.

1(28). "As many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law, and as many as have sinned in the Law shall be judged by the Law.

---

[104] Luke 23:43
[105] Luke 23:46. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.42.6.
[106] Luke 23:50; 53. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.42.7.
[107] Luke 23:56
[108] Luke 24:5-7. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.43.5.
[109] Luke 24:25-26; 30-31. Cf. Adam. 4.12; Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.43.4.
[110] Luke 24:38-39. Cf. Adam. 5.12; Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.43.6.

For not the hearers of the Law are just before God, but the doers of the Law shall be justified."[111]

2(29). "Circumcision verily profiteth if thou keep the Law; but if thou be a breaker of the Law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision."[112]

3(30). "Which hast the form of knowledge and of the truth in the Law."[113]

4(31). "For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly."[114]

5(32). "Wherefore the Law is holy, and the commandment holy and just and good."[115]

6(33). "That the requirement of the Law might be fulfilled in us."[116]

7(34). "For Christ is the fulfillment of the Law for righteousness to everyone that believeth."[117]

8(35). "He that loveth his neighbor hath fulfilled the Law."[118]

The First Epistle to the Thessalonians, <number five in Marcion's canon>, but number eight in ours.

The Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, <number six in Marcion's canon>, but number nine in ours.

From the Epistle to Ephesians, number seven <in Marcion's canon>, but number five in ours.

1(36) "Remember that ye, being in time past gentiles, who are called uncircumcision by that which is called the circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world. But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by his blood. For he is our peace, who hath made both one,"[119] and so on.

2(37). "Wherefore he saith, Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, <and> Christ shall give thee light."[120]

---

[111] Rom 2:13
[112] Rom 2:25
[113] Rom 2:20
[114] Rom 5:6
[115] Rom 7:12. Cf. Adam. 2.20; Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.13.14.
[116] Rom 8:4
[117] Rom 10:4. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.14.6.
[118] Rom 13:8.
[119] Eph 2:11-14. Cf. Adam. 2.18; Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.17.12; 14.
[120] Eph 5:14

3(38). "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, <and> shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh,"[121] minus the phrase, "unto his wife."

<From the Epistle> to the Colossians, number eight <in Marcion's canon>, but number seven in ours.

1(39). "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon and sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come."[122]

The Epistle to Philemon, number nine <in Marcion's canon>, but number thirteen, or even fourteen, in ours.

The Epistle to the Philippians, number ten <in Marcion's canon>, but number six in ours.

<From the Epistle> to the Laodiceans, number eleven <in Marcion's canon>.

1(<40>). "(There is) one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in all."[123]

From the Epistle to the Galatians, number one <in Marcion's canon>, but number four in ours.

1. "Learn that the just shall live by faith. For as many as are under the Law are under a curse; but, The man that doeth them shall live by them."[124]

2. "Cursed is everyone that hangeth upon a tree; but he that is of promise is by the freewoman."[125]

3. "I testify again that a man that is circumcised is a debtor to do the whole Law."[126]

<4.> In place of, "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump," he put, "corrupteth the whole lump."[127]

<5.> "For all the Law is fulfilled by you; thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."[128]

6. "Now the works of the flesh are manifest which are these: Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft,hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, factions, envyings, drunkenness, revellings—of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God."[129]

---

[121] Eph 5:31. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.18.9.
[122] Col. 2:16-17. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.19.9.
[123] Cf. Eph. 4:5-6; Adam. 2.19.
[124] Gal 3:11b; 10a; 12b
[125] Gal. 3:13; 4:23; Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.3.10; 4.8.
[126] Gal 5:3
[127] Gal 5:9
[128] Gal 5:14. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.4.12.
[129] Gal 5:19-21

7. "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts."[130]

8. "For neither do they themselves who are circumcised (now) keep the Law."[131]

<From the> First <Epistle> to the Corinthians, number two in Marcion's own canon and in ours.

1(9). "For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to naught the understanding of the prudent."[132]

2(10). "That, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord."[133]

3(11). "Of the first beings of this world that come to naught."[134]

4(12). "For it is written, He taketh the wise in their own craftiness." And again, "The Lord knoweth the thoughts of men, that they are vain."[135]

5(13). "For even Christ our passover is sacrificed."[136]

6(14). "Know ye not that he which is joined to an harlot is one body? For two, saith he, shall be one flesh."[137]

7(15). Given in an altered form. In place of, "in the Law," he says "in the Law of Moses." But before this he says, "Or saith not the Law the same also?"[138]

8(16). "Doth God take care for oxen?"[139]

9(17). "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant how that our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink. For they drank of a spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ. But with many of them God was not well pleased. Now these things were our examples, to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted. Neither be ye idolaters as were some of them; as it is written, The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play. Neither let us tempt Christ," until the words, "These things happened unto them for examples, and they were written for us,"[140] and so on.

---

[130] Gal 5:24
[131] Gal 6:13
[132] 1 Cor 1:19. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.5.5.
[133] 1 Cor 1:31. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.5.10.
[134] 1 Cor 2:6
[135] 1 Cor 3:19-20. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.6.12.
[136] 1 Cor 5:7. Cf. Adam. 2.18; Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.7.3.
[137] 1 Cor 6:16
[138] 1 Cor 9:9; 8. "Of Moses" is also in the "ecclesiastical text." Adam. 1.22 witnesses to its presence in Marcion's canon.
[139] 1 Cor 9:9. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.7.10.
[140] 1 Cor 10:1-9; 11. Cf. Adam. 2.18; Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.7.12-14.

10(18). "What say I then? That sacrificial meat is anything, or that that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is anything? But the things which they sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils and not to God."[141] But Marcion added, "Sacrificial meat."

11(19). "A man ought not to have long hair, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God."[142]

12(20). "But God hath composed the body."[143]

13(21). Marcion has erroneously added the words, "on the Law's account," <after>, "Yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding."[144]

14(22). "In the Law it is written, With men of other tongues and other lips will I speak unto this people."[145]

15(23). "Let your women keep silence in the church; For it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the Law."[146]

16(24). On resurrection of the dead: "Brethren, I make known unto you the gospel which I preached unto you."[147] Also, "If Christ be not raised, it is in vain,"[148] and so on. "So we preach, and so ye believed…[149] that Christ died, and was buried, and rose again the third day…When this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory."[150]

From the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, number three in Marcion's canon and ours

1(25). "For all the promises of God have their Yea in him; therefore through him we utter Amen to God."[151]

2(26). "For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants through Jesus. For God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness…"[152]

---

[141] 1 Cor 10:19
[142] 1 Cor 11:7. Cf. Adam. 5.23; Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.8.1.
[143] 1 Cor 12:24
[144] 1 Cor 14:19
[145] 1 Cor 14:21. Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.18.10.
[146] 1 Cor 14:34. Cf. Adam. 2.18; Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.8.11.
[147] 1 Cor 15:1
[148] 1 Cor 15:17
[149] 1 Cor 15:11
[150] 1 Cor 15:3-4
[151] 2 Cor 1:20. Cf. Adam. 2.18.
[152] 2 Cor 4:5-6. Cf. Adam 2.19; Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.11.11.

3(27). "We having the same Spirit of faith also believe and therefore speak." But he excised, "according as it is written."[153]

11,9 This is Marcion's corrupt compilation, containing a version and form of the Gospel according to Luke, and an incomplete one of the apostle Paul—not of all his epistles (10) but simply of Romans, Ephesians, Colossians, Laodiceans, Galatians, First and Second Corinthians, First and Second Thessalonians, Philemon and Philippians. (11) (There is no version) of First and Second Timothy, Titus, and Hebrews <in his scripture at all, and> even the epistles that are there <have been mutilated>, since they are not all there but are counterfeits. (12) And <I found> that this compilation had been tampered with throughout, and had supplemental material added in certain passages—not for any use, but for inferior, harmful strange sayings against the sound faith, <fictitious> creatures of Marcion's cracked brain.

11,13 I have made this laborious, searching compilation from the scripture he has chosen, Paul and the Gospel according to Luke, <so that> all who are attempting to contradict his imposture may understand that the altered sayings have been fraudulently inserted, (14) and that any not in their proper places have been stolen from them by his audacity. For the oaf thought that only these run counter to his false notion.

11,15 But there is a third <work> of my scholarship: the compilation of whatever material he and we have in common, and whose meaning is the Savior's incarnation and his testimony to the agreement of the New Testament with the Old—and the acknowledgment in the Gospel, by the Son of God, that God is the maker of heaven and earth and the same God who spoke in the Law and the prophets, and that this God is his own Father. (16) And here is the brief arrangement of that work of mine, transcribed word for word by myself from copies of Marcion in the form of scholia with exegetical comments, to serve as an outline. (17) But so that the difficult things in it will not be obscure to some and fail to be understood, I shall in turn explain of the several entries in order—I mean the first entry, the second, the third (and so on)—the reason why each saying was selected and transferred here.[154] I begin as follows.

---

[153] 2 Cor 4:13

[154] I.e., in what follows the quotations from Marcion with Epiph's occasional comments on the text, were the "scholia and notes." These were collected for the benefit of anyone who wanted to write a full dress refutation of Marcion. The elenchi which accompany them are being written by Epiph now, as part of his *Panarion*.

Scholion <One>, from Marcion's Own Version of the Gospel "Go, show thyself unto the priest, and offer for thy cleansing, according as Moses commanded—that this may be a testimony unto you" instead of the Savior's "for a testimony unto them."

(a) Elenchus 1. How could the Lord whose teachings—as you say—were always against the Law, say to the persons he had healed, I mean to the leper, "Go, show thyself unto the priest?" Since he says, "to the priest," he does not reject the priesthood of the Law.

(b) "And offer for thy cleansing." Even if you excise "the gift," it will be evident, from the word, "offer," that he is speaking of a gift.

(c) "For thy cleansing, according as Moses commanded." If he advises obedience to Moses' commandment, he is not rejecting or insulting the God of the Law, but acknowledging that both he and God, his Father, have given the Law to Moses.

(d) You have twisted the wording, Marcion, by saying "testimony unto you" instead of "testimony unto them." In this too you have plainly lied against your own head. If he were saying, "testimony unto you," he would be calling himself to witness that "I came not to destroy the Law or the prophets, but to fulfil."[155]

Scholion 2. "But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power to forgive sins upon earth."

Elenchus 2. If he calls himself "Son of Man," the Only-begotten does not deny his humanity, and there is no use in your yapping about his being manifest in appearance. And if he has authority on earth, the earth is not foreign to his creations and his Father's.

Scholion 3. "The Son of Man is lord also of the Sabbath."

Elenchus 3. The Savior is acknowledging two things at once in teaching that he is both Son of Man and Lord of the Sabbath, so that the Sabbath will not be thought foreign to this creation, <and he himself will not be thought foreign to the Father's Godhead>—even if, in the last analysis, he is called Son of Man because of the incarnation.

Scholion 4. "Judas Iscariot, which was a betrayer." Instead of, "He came down with them," he has, "He came down among them."

(a) Elenchus 4. Judas Iscariot, "which was a betrayer." Betrayer of whom, pray? Surely of the One who was arrested—yes indeed, and who has been crucified and has suffered many things. (b) But how can he be

[155] Matt 5:17

arrested and crucified if, as you claim, Marcion, he is not tangible? You say he is an apparition! (c) But your opinion will be refuted because the text calls Judas a "betrayer," for he betrayed his own master and delivered him into the hands of men. (d) And it does you no good to say, "He came down among them," instead of, "with them." You cannot declare someone a phantom when you later show, even though unintentionally, that he is tangible.

Scholion 5. "And the whole multitude sought to touch him. And he lifted up his eyes," and so forth.

Elenchus 5. Again, how could the multitude have touched him if he was intangible? And what sort of eyes did he raise to heaven, if he was not composed of flesh? But he did this to show that the mediator between God and man is a man, Christ Jesus, and that he has both—his flesh from men, but his invisible essence from God the Father.

Scholion 6. "In the like manner did your fathers unto the prophets."

Elenchus 6. If he has mentioned prophets he does not deny prophets. If he avenges the murder of the prophets and blames their murderers and persecutors, he is not foreign to prophets. Rather, he is their god, who establishes their authenticity.

Scholion 7. "I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel."

Elenchus 7. If "*even* in Israel" he did not find "such faith" as he did in the gentile centurion, then he is not finding fault with Israel's faith. For if it were faith in a strange God and not faith in his Father himself, he would not speak in praise of it.

Scholion 8. "Blessed is he who shall not be offended in me," is altered. For he had it as though with reference to John.

(a) Whether this refers to John or to the Savior himself, he still says "blessed" of those who do not stumble, whether at him or at John, so that they will not make things up which they do not learn from him.

(b) But there is a more important consideration here, the real reason why the Savior spoke. Lest it be thought that John, whom he had ranked as the greatest of those born of woman, was greater even than the Savior himself—since he too was born of woman—he says as a safeguard, "And blessed is whoso shall not be offended in me."

(c) Hence he says, "He that is less in the kingdom is greater than he." Chronologically, counting from his birth in the flesh, he was six months "less" than John; but as John's God he was plainly "greater" in the kingdom. (d) For the Only-begotten did not come to say anything in secret, or to tell

any lie about his own message. He says, "I have not spoken in secret, but openly."[156] For he is truth, as he says, "I am the way and the truth."[157] The way, then, contains no error; nor does the truth lie by concealing itself.

Scholion 9. "He it is of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face."

(a) Elenchus 9. If God's only-begotten Son recognizes John and foreknows him, and because he foreknows him tells those who are willing to know the truth that this is the one of whom it is written, "I send my messenger before thy face"—(b) then the one who said in writing, "I send my messenger before thy face," God the eternal who has spoken in the prophets and Law, was not foreign to his own Son, Jesus Christ. (c) For he sends his messenger before his face—before the face of a Son honored by a Father. He was not sending his messenger to serve a foreigner of whom, as you say, Marcion, he was even the opposite.

Scholion 10. "And entering into the Pharisee's house he reclined at table. And the woman which was a sinner, standing at his feet behind him, washed his feet with her tears, and wiped and kissed them."

Elenchus 10. "Entering" is indicative of a body, for it indicates a house and the dimensions of a body. And "reclining" can be said only of a person <with> a solid body, which is lying down. And as to the woman's washing his feet with her tears, she did not wash the feet of an apparition or phantom; she wiped, washed and kissed them because she felt the touch of the body.

Scholion 11. And again, "She hath washed my feet with her tears, and wiped and kissed them."

Elenchus 11. Lest you think, Marcion, that the sinful woman's washing, anointing and kissing of the Savior's feet was merely people's supposition, the Savior himself confirms it and teaches that it did not take place in appearance but in reality—confidently affirming, for the Pharisee's refutation and your own, Marcion, and the refutation of people like yourself, "She hath washed my feet and kissed them." But which feet, other than feet made of flesh, bones and the rest?

Scholion 12. He did not have, "His mother and his brethren," but simply "Thy mother and thy brethren."

(a) Elenchus 12. Even though you falsify the Gospel's wording earlier, Marcion, to keep the evangelist from agreeing with the words which some

---

[156] Cf. John 18:20.
[157] John 14:6

had said, "thy mother and thy brethren," you cannot get round the truth. (b) Why did he not call many women mothers? Why did he not speak of many countries? How many persons say any number of things of Homer? Some claim he was Egyptian—others, that he was from Chios; others, from Colophon; others, a Phrygian. Others, Meletus and Critheidus, say that he came from Smyrna. Aristarchus declared him an Athenian, others a Lydian from Maeon, others, a Cypriote from the district of Propodias in the environs of Salamis—though Homer was a man, surely! But because of his having been in many countries, he has caused many to (give) a different description (of him).

(c) But here, when they were speaking of God and Christ, they did not suppose that he had many mothers—just the one who had actually borne him. Or many brothers—only Joseph's sons by his actual other wife. And you cannot take up arms against the truth.

(d) And do not let the thing the Lord said, "Who are my mother and brethren?" mislead you. He did not say this to deny his mother, but to reproach the untimely speech of the person who spoke when there was such a large crowd surrounding him, when his saving teaching was pouring forth and he himself was busy with healings and preaching. For the speaker to cut him off by saying, "Behold thy mother and thy brethren," was an obvious interruption. (e) And if it was not because he received the message with joy—not that he did not know they had come before he heard it, but because he foreknew that they were standing outside—then he would have said this to counter the speaker's untimely utterance with a rebuke, as he once told Peter, "Away from me, Satan, for thou intendest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of man."[158]

Scholion 13. "As they sailed he fell asleep. Then he arose and rebuked the wind and the sea."

(a) Elenchus 13. Who fell asleep, pray? You won't dare to say this of the Godhead—or even if you should you will be blaspheming against your own head, you madman. But anyone can see that the truly incarnate Christ, needing sleep, fell asleep because of his bodily nature. (b) For those who woke him did not see an apparition, but One truly incarnate. Of course they are bearing witness that they roused him by shaking and calling him! (c) For when it says he "arose"—the God in flesh who had fallen asleep, the One who had come from heaven and donned flesh for us "arose" as man, but as God "rebuked" the sea and caused <a calm>.

[158] Mark 8:33

Scholion 14. "And it came to pass as they went the people thronged him, and a woman touched him, and was healed of her blood. And the Lord said, Who touched me?" And again, "Somebody hath touched me; for I perceive that virtue hath gone out of me."

(a) Elenchus 14. "As they went." It did not say, "as he went," so as not to represent him as "going" other than as wayfarers usually do. But as to, "The people thronged him," the crowds could not throng a spirit. And a woman who touched him and was healed touched, not air but human tangibility. (b) For to show that the woman's touch of his body was not merely apparent, he teaches (the contrary) by saying, "Who touched me? For I perceive that virtue hath gone out of me."

Scholion 15. "Looking up to heaven he pronounced a blessing upon them."

Elenchus 15. If he looked up to heaven and pronounced a blessing upon them, he did not have the forms of eyes and the other members in (mere) appearance.

Scholion 16. "Saying, The Son of Man must suffer many things, and be slain, and be raised after three days."

(a) Elenchus 16. If the only-begotten Son of God acknowledged that he was the Son of Man, and <would> suffer and be put to death, this is an axe pointed at you, Marcion, grubbing up your whole root—you scion of thorns, you waterless cloud, you barren tree with dead leaves! (b) For he says in turn, "and be raised again after three days." But what was it that was raised, except the very thing that had suffered and been buried in the sepulchre? There could be no funeral and interment of a phantom, a wind, a spirit, or an illusion, and no resurrection of them.

Scholion 17. "And behold, there talked with him two men, Elijah and Moses in glory."

(a) Elenchus 17. Marcion, I can well believe that the holy Zechariah's pruninghook (raised) against you is typified by these words—cutting away all the falsehood against the Law and the prophets that you have invented. (b) For because you would deny the Law and the prophets and call them foreign to the Savior and his glory and inspired teaching, he brought both men with him in his own glory, and showed them to his disciples. And the disciples showed them to us and the world—that is to everyone who desires life—to chop your roots with the first as with an axe, and with the second, trim your branches off as with the pruninghook of the utterance of the truth—the branches which secrete the hemlock and deadly poison for men, the oily sap of blasphemy! (c) For if Moses, to whom Christ entrusted the Law long ago, were a stranger to him, and if the prophets were strangers, he would not reveal them with him in his own glory.

(d) For see the wonder! He did not show them to us in the tomb, or beside the cross. But when he revealed the portion of his glory to us as though for a pledge, then he brought the saints, I mean Moses and Elijah, with him, to show that these were fellow-heirs of his kingdom.

Scholion 18. "Out of the cloud a voice, This is my beloved Son."

(a) Elenchus 18. Anyone can see that the cloud is not in the remote heights or above the heavens, but is in the creation around us from which the voice came to the Savior. (b) Hence, even though the Father spoke from a cloud to indicate the Son to the disciples, the demiurge is not a different person but the same One who bore witness to his own Son out of a cloud, and is not, as Marcion claims, master only of the realms above heaven.

Scholion 19. "I besought thy disciples." But in addition to, "And they could not cast it out," he had, "And he said to them, O faithless generation, how long shall I suffer you?"

Elenchus 19. "How long" is an indication of a time span in Christ's incarnate life; "O faithless generation," indicates that the prophets worked miracles in his name and believed as we find Elijah doing, and Elisha and the others.

Scholion 20. "For the Son of Man shall be delivered into the hands of men."

Elenchus 20. The appearance of a "Son of Man," and of one who will be "delivered into the hands of men," is not the appearance of an apparition or phantom, but the sight of a body and limbs.

Scholion 21. "Have ye not read so much as this, what David did: he went into the house of God."

Elenchus 21. If he calls the house of the tabernacle which Moses erected a "house of God," he does not deny the Law, or the God who spoke in the Law. For he says that the person who is his father is "God," <and the Father spoke in the Law through the Son and the Holy Spirit>, or the Only-begotten spoke in it himself. For a Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, is regularly at work in the Law, the prophets, the Gospels and the Apostles.

Scholion 22. "I thank thee, Lord of heaven." But he did not have "and earth" or "Father." He is shown up, however; for further on he had, "Even so, Father."

(a) Elenchus 22. He gives thanks to the "Lord of heaven," Marcion, even if you take away "<and> earth"—<and> even if you remove "Father" so as not to show that Christ is calling the demiurge his father. For the limbs of the truth remain alive. (b) Just as you forgetfully retained "Even so, Father," Marcion, as a leftover, <so the heaven whose Lord you admit the Father is, is the heaven of the created world around us>. Hence it is

proven by every means that Christ is giving thanks to his own Father and calling him "Lord of heaven." And your madness is severe, since it does not see where the truth is going.

Scholion 23. "He said to the lawyer, What is written in the Law?" And after the lawyer's answer he replied, "Thou hast answered right. This do, and thou shalt live."

(a) Elenchus 23. Since he is truth, the Son of God deceived no one who inquired about life, for he had come for man's life. Since life is his concern and since he indicates to the man who is keeping the Law that the Law is life—and since he told the person who answered in terms of the Law that he had spoken rightly and "This do and thou shalt live"—(b) who could be cracked enough to believe Marcion when he blasphemes against the God who has granted men both the Law and the grace of the Gospel and be carried away with one who has received none of his teaching either from the Law or from the Holy Spiritt?

Scholion 24. And he said, "Which of you shall have a friend, and shall go unto him at midnight, asking three loaves?" And then, "Ask, and it shall be given. If a son shall ask a fish of any of you that is a father, will he for a fish give him a serpent, or a scorpion for an egg? If ye then, being evil, know of good gifts, how much more the Father?"

(a) Elenchus 24. The wilfulness of the swindler's way of life is exposed by this text. The way of life he practices is not for continence' sake, or for the good reward and hope of the contest, but for impiety and the badness of a wrong opinion. (b) For he teaches that one must not eat meat, and claims that those who eat flesh are liable to the judgment, as they would be for eating souls.

(c) But this is altogether foolish. The flesh is not the soul; the soul is in the flesh. And we do not say that the soul in animals is as valuable as men's, but is simply a soul to make the animal alive. But this pitiable wretch, together with those who share this opinion, supposes that the same soul is in men and in animals.

(d) This is the futile supposition of many misguided sects. For Valentinus and Colorbasus, and all Gnostics and Manichaeans, claim that there is a reincarnation of souls as well as transmigrations of the souls of ignorant persons—as they say themselves on the basis of some myth. They say that the soul returns and is reembodied in each of the animals until it comes to awareness, and so, cleansed and set free, departs to the heavens.

(e) And in the first place, the whole worthless contrivance of the myth itself stands exposed. No one else can know the exact truth of these things better than our Lord Jesus Christ, who came for "the sheep that was

lost"—that is, for the souls of men. (f) Because he was in charge of them he healed them in body and soul, <as> the Lord of body and soul and giver of the life here and the life to come. And he did not raise those who had died—I mean Lazarus, the ruler's son, and the daughter of the ruler of the synagogue—in order to do them harm, as in the sects' doctrine that the body is a prison. He raised them to do them good, and in the knowledge that both our sojourn here in the flesh, and the coming resurrection of flesh and soul, are by his decree.

(g) And if, again, he knew that the soul in animals and human beings is one soul and he came to secure its salvation, then, after he had cleansed one demoniac—I mean the one who came out of the tombs—he should not have told the demons to go and kill two thousand swine. Not if the souls of the men and the swine were just alike! Why would he cause the destruction of two thousand in order to care for one?

(h) But if, again, Marcion twists round like a serpent by craftily replying that Christ freed the swine's souls from their bodies in order to allow their ascent—then he should not have returned Lazarus to his body, since he had been set free from it! Instead, he should have freed the demoniac himself from the chain of the body as well! But he did not; rather, he provided for the body as he did, knowing what was to its advantage.

(i) Your argument about the soul has crumpled, Marcion, and your followers' argument, and the other sectarians'. And yet I am going to speak once more of your bogus way of life, since you say that eating meat is wicked and unlawful. (j) But the Savior refutes you, knowing more than you and giving the better teaching with such a saying as this: he says, "Which of you, whose son shall ask for a fish, will give him a serpent, or, for an egg, a scorpion?" And further on, "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father?"[159] (k) Thus, if he called a fish and an egg "good gifts," nothing God has granted is evil if it is eaten with thanksgiving; and your malice stands refuted in every respect.

Scholion 25. The saying about Jonah the prophet has been falsified; Marcion had, "This generation, no sign shall be given it." But he did not have the passages about Nineveh, the queen of the south, and Solomon.

(a) Elenchus 25. Even in the very places you see fit to falsify, Marcion, you cannot avoid the truth. Even if you remove the <part> about the prophet Jonah—which signifies the Savior's dispensation[160]—and take out

[159] Luke 11:11-13

[160] οἰκονομία, in this case, his death and resurrection.

the part about the queen of the south and Solomon, and the story of Nineveh's salvation and the preaching of Jonah, the very saying of the Savior that precedes these will expose <you>. (b) For he says, "*This* generation asketh a sign, and there shall no sign be given it,"[161] implying that those who preceded this generation were vouchsafed signs from heaven by God. (c) Thus Elijah worked a miracle with the fire which came down from heaven and took his sacrifice. Moses divided the sea, pierced the rock and water flowed forth, brought manna from heaven. Joshua the son of Nun stopped the sun and moon. And in any case, even if the swindler conceals what is written in scripture, he will do the truth no harm but will estrange himself from the truth.

Scholion 26. Instead of, "Ye pass over the judgment of God" he had, "Ye pass over the calling of God."

(a) Elenchus 26. Where is there not refutation for you? Where can one <not> get evidence against you? The earlier sources agree with the later ones when your tampering is being exposed. (b) For if he says, "Ye hold the traditions of your elders and pass over the mercy and judgment of God," find out for how long he accuses them of doing this, and when the tradition of the elders arose! (c) You will find that the tradition of Adda arose after the return from Babylon, but that the tradition of Aqiba had come into being even before the Babylonian captivities, and that of the sons of Hasmonaeus at the time of Alexander and Antiochus, 190 years before Christ's incarnation. (d) As early as that, then, judgment was by the Law and mercy was by the prophets, and your trashy argument is a failure from every standpoint.

Scholion 27. "Woe unto you, for ye build the sepulchres of the prophets, and your fathers killed them."

(a) Elenchus 27. If he expresses his concern for the prophets by reproaching the people who killed them, the prophets were not strange to him. They were his servants, and sent before him by himself, the Father and the Holy Spirit, as messengers to prepare for his coming in the flesh.

They witnessed to the New Testament as well. (b) Moses, by saying, "The Lord God will raise up unto you a prophet of your brethren, like unto me."[162] Jacob before him, by saying, "Thou hast come up, my son Judah, from a young plant; falling down thou didst sleep. There shall not fail a ruler from Judah"[163]—and shortly after that, "till he come for whom

[161] Luke 11:29
[162] Deut 18:15
[163] Gen 49:9-10

are the things prepared, and he is the expectation of the gentiles, and in him shall the gentiles hope."[164]

(c) Isaiah: "Behold, the Virgin shall conceive";[165] Jeremiah: "And he is a man, and who shall know him?"[166] Micah: "And thou, Bethlehem," some other material, and, "out of thee shall come for me a governor,"[167] and so on. Malachi: "The Lord shall suddenly come to the temple";[168] David: "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand,"[169] and so on. And there is a great deal to say, with the Savior himself, also, saying, "Had ye believed Moses ye would have believed me also, for he wrote of me."[170]

Scholion 28. He did not have, "Therefore said the wisdom of God, I send unto them prophets," and the statement that the blood of Zacharias, Abel and the prophets will be required of this generation.

Elenchus 28. Here too there is a great embarrassment for you, Marcion, since the standard of the truth is preserved, and your removal of the texts you have stolen can be discovered from the authentic copy of Luke's Gospel with the passages which are still there, and your excisions exposed.

Scholion 29. "I say unto my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body. Fear him which, after he hath killed, hath authority to cast into hell." But he did not have, "Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings, and not one of them is forgotten before God."

(a) Elenchus 29. Marcion, the lines, "I say unto my friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body; fear him which, after he hath killed the body, hath authority to cast the soul into hell," compel you to acknowledge the sequel of the parable as well. For no event occurs without God, even if you take out the part about the sparrows.

(b) Defend yourself then, Marcion, about the words you have left in the text, and tell us your opinion of the person who has "authority." For if you should say that he is Christ's Father, your so-called "good God"—then, even though you make a wrong distinction, still, since he has "authority," you have granted that he is a judge and awards everyone what they deserve.

(c) If, however, you say that not he, but the demiurge you keep yapping about is really a judge, tell me who has given him the authority! If he has it of himself, he is supreme and is possessed of authority—but if he has

---

[164] Gen 49:10
[165] Isa 7:14
[166] Jerem 17:9
[167] Micah 5:2
[168] Mal 3:1
[169] Ps 109:1
[170] John 5:45

the authority to judge, he also has the authority to save! For he who is able to judge, is also able to pardon.

(d) And from another standpoint: If, when the judge casts the souls into hell, the good God does not rescue them even though he is in full charge of these very souls, how can he be "good"? It must be that the judge is stronger than he, and he cannot deliver them from his power—or that he can and does not want to and then, where is his goodness?

(e) But if, since the judge created the souls himself he also has the right to judge them, why does your mythical God on high do things part way and save (only) certain ones? For if he saves them by taking them from someone else's domain, he is covetous, since he has a desire for someone else's souls. But if you deny that this is covetousness, since what he does is good and for salvation, you are making him a respecter of persons who does not do good equally to all, but (only) in part.

Scholion 30. Instead of, "He shall confess before the angels of God," Marcion says, "before God."

Elenchus 30. If he alters the truth even in its least important expression it he is convicted of deviating from God's way in every respect. For a person who dares to alter any part of the scriptures is not in the way of the truth to begin with.

Scholion 31. He does not have, "God doth clothe the grass."

Elenchus 31. Even though you do not leave the written phrases as they were when they were spoken by the Savior, still the passages are preserved in the Gospel of the holy church—even if you deny the God who has created all and cares for all things, even the grass, by his word, and who is confessed by the Savior.

Scholion 32. "And your Father knoweth that ye have need of these things," meaning material things.

Elenchus 32. The Father knows that the disciples need material things, and provides for such. But he provides, not in another world but here, making the provision for his own servants, not in someone else's territory but in the one he has created.

Scholion 33. "But seek ye the kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you."

(a) Elenchus 33. If we draw our sustenance from the creatures of one God, while another one is the God of the kingdom of heaven, how can the saying be self-consistent? Either what is here is his and the kingdom is his, and he accordingly "adds" everything here—which is his—because of the burden of our longing for his kingdom. (b) Or the kingdom and the world there are his, while what is here belongs to the demiurge, and the

demiurge consents to the kingdom of the God on high by rendering aid to those who seek the righteousness and kingdom of the God on high. (c) But since consent is one and is not at variance, there cannot be two first principles, or three. For God, in fact, is one, the one who made all things, but made them well, not the opposite. Sin and error, however, belong to us, by virtue of our willing them and not willing them.

Scholion 34. Instead of, "Your Father," Marcion had, "Father."

Elenchus 34. Even here you will do us no harm, but lend further confirmation to us. For you have admitted that the Savior said his Father provides for the things that are here.

Scholion 35. Instead, "in the second or third watch," he had, "in the evening watch."

Elenchus 35. The oaf stands convicted of stupidly distorting the sacred words in accordance with his own opinion. Watches are not kept in the daytime but at night, and extend successively from evening until the first hour—not from dawn till evening, as he is caught tampering with them.

Scholion 36. "The Lord of that servant will come and will cut him in sunder, and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers."

(a) Elenchus 36. Who is it that cuts the servant in two, pray? If it is the demiurge and judge whom you call God who will do this, then the believers belong to him. For to punish the servant who is not doing well, he assigns his portion with the unbelievers.

(b) But if it is Christ's Father, or Christ himself, who will do this, then you are plainly preserving the testimony against yourself in your own teaching. For in admitting that either Christ or his Father will do this, you have unambiguously acknowledged that the judge and the good God are the same, and that <he> who provides for those who are here, and for those who are there, is one.

Scholion 37. "Lest he hale thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer."

(a) Elenchus 37. You say that the demiurge is a judge and that each of his angels is an officer, and that they will call the sinners to account for their deeds. But which deeds other than the errors and sins which Jesus also detests, and you say that you too forbid? (b) Now if the demiurge and judge detests the same deeds that the good God detests, by the fact and by the common consent he is shown to be one and the same (as he).

Scholion 38. There was falsification of "There came some that told him of the Galilaeans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices" until the mention of the eighteen who died in the tower at Siloam, and of "Except ye repent" <and so forth>, until the parable of the fig tree of

which the cultivator said, "I am digging about it and dunging it, and if it bear no fruit, cut it down."

(a) Elenchus 38. The bandit caused the removal of all this to conceal the truth from himself, because of the Lord's agreement with Pilate who had rightly condemned such persons, and because the men at Siloam died rightly, since they were sinners and God punished them in this way. (b) But when people tamper with imperial decrees, the copies with certified texts are produced from the archives to rebut the fools. Thus too, when the Gospel is brought forth from the king's palace, that is, God's holy church, it exposes the flies that spot the king's fine robes.

Scholion 39. "This woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound."

Elenchus 39. If, when he has come, the Lord takes care of Abraham's daughter, Abraham is no stranger to him. For he acknowledges his approval of him by showing pity for his daughter.

Scholion 40. Again, he falsified, "Then shall ye see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob and all the prophets in the kingdom of God." In place of this he put, "When ye see all the righteous in the kingdom of God, and yourselves thrust"—but he put "kept"—"out." There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.'"

(a) Elenchus 40. How plain the traces of the truth are! No one can hide a road. He can lead men off it, and hide it from those who do not know it, but from those who are familiar with it it is impossible to hide it. (b) For he cannot make the ground invisible where the road used to be. And even if he makes it hard to see, since the road's location surely remains the person who tampered with the road is exposed by those who know it.

(c) Now then, observe the traces of the route. To whom did he say this but to the Jews? And if he said it to the Jews, he proved by the same token that they were within the kingdom, and were being cast out by the righteous. (d) Now who could <these> be but the forefathers of the Jews, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the prophets? For he did not say, "Ye shall see the righteous entering and yourselves not entering," but, "Ye shall see the righteous *in* the kingdom and yourselves cast out." (e) And he gave an anticipatory ruling regarding "the ones cast out"; but he showed that those who were already righteous were not unrelated to them by birth or calling, but had been called with them, and justified already before his incarnation. (f) And though <he meant that the Jews> remain outside, <he surely did not mean all of them>, since the patriarchs are within.

And how can there be gnashing of teeth at the judgment, you fool, if there is no resurrection of bodies?

Scholion 41. Again, he falsified, "They shall come from the east and from the west, and shall sit down in the kingdom," "The last shall be first," "The Pharisees came saying, Get thee out and depart, for Herod will kill thee." Also, "He said, Go ye and tell that fox," till the words, "It cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem" and, "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent," "Often would I have gathered, as a hen, thy children," "Your house is left unto you desolate," and, "Ye shall not see me until ye shall say, Blessed."

Elenchus 41. See the extent of his presumption! How much of the Gospel will he amputate? It is as though someone were to take an animal, chop half of its body off, and try to convince the ignorant with the (remaining) half, by saying that the animal looked like that, and nothing had been removed from it.

Scholion 42. Again, he falsified the entire parable of the two sons, the one who took his share of the property and spent it on dissipation, and the other.

Elenchus 42. The results of his tampering (here) will be no different from his previous presumptions. He is inflicting the loss on himself, while the truth remains as God has taught it.

Scholion 43. "The Law and the prophets were until John, and every man presseth into it."

Elenchus 43. If he prescribes a Law and names prophets, and does not declare the Law lawlessness or accuse the prophets of being false prophets, it is plainly acknowledged that the Savior has testified to the prophets; and it is proved that they prophesied of him.

Scholion 44. The material about the rich man, and Lazarus the beggar's being carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom.

(a) Elenchus 44. Observe! Abraham was included by the Lord among those who live and are blessed, and are in the inheritance of repose, and Lazarus was vouchsafed a place in his bosom! (b) Do not insult Abraham any more, Marcion, who recognized his own Master and said "Lord, the judge of all the earth"[170] to him. For see, it was testified by the Lord himself that Abraham is righteous, and no stranger to the life which is praised by the Savior.

Scholion 45. "But now he is comforted," again meaning Lazarus.

Elenchus 45. If Lazarus is comforted in the bosom of Abraham, Abraham is not excluded from the comfort of life.

Scholion 46. Abraham said, "They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them, for neither will they hear him who is risen from the dead."

(a) Elenchus 46. It is not as though Abraham were still in the world and were testifying to the Law of Moses and the prophets under some misapprehension, or that he does not know what comes of these; it is after he has experienced the repose there. (b) For it is testified by the Savior in the parable that Abraham obtained salvation after death by the teachings of Law and prophets—and by practicing them before there was a Law! (c) And likewise, that those too who kept the Law after that, and obeyed the prophets, are in his bosom and depart to life with him. Of these Lazarus was one, who was vouchsafed the blessedness of Abraham's life-giving bosom through the Law and the prophets.

Scholion 47. He falsified, "Say, we are unprofitable servants; we have done that which was our duty to do."

Elenchus 47. He does not accept even the safeguard of the Lord's teaching! As a safeguard for his own disciples, lest they lose the reward of their labor through arrogance, he would counsel humility. But Marcion does not accept this; in everything he was inspired by pride, not truth.

Scholion 48. When the ten lepers met him. Marcion cut a great deal out and wrote, "He sent them away, saying, Show yourselves unto the priests," and yet he made a substitution and said, "Many lepers were in the days of Elisha the prophet, and none was cleansed, saving Naaman the Syrian."

Elenchus 48. Here too the Lord calls Elisha a prophet, and says that he himself is accomplishing the things which, equally, had been done before him by Elisha—in refutation of Marcion and all who make light of God's prophets.

Scholion 49. "The days will come when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of Man."

Elenchus 49. If he counts days, designates a time, and calls himself Son of Man, he indicated both a limit to his life, and a term of the days of his preaching. Thus the Word is not without flesh, but a body is his choice.

Scholion 50. "One said unto him, Good master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? He replied, "Call not thou me good. One is good, God." Marcion added, "the Father," and instead of, "Thou knowest the commandments" says, "I know the commandments."

Elenchus 50. To keep from showing that the commandments have already been written, he says, "I know the commandments." But the whole point is plain from what follows. And if he says that a "Father" is "good" and terms him God, he is rightly teaching the man who wants to inherit eternal life out of his Father's Law, and is not belittling or rejecting him. Instead he is bearing witness that those who lived under the Law, both Moses and the other prophets, have inherited eternal life.

Scholion 51. "And it came to pass that as he was come nigh unto Jericho, a blind man cried, Jesus, thou Son of David, have mercy on me. And when he was healed, he said, Thy faith hath saved thee."

Elenchus 51. There can be no lie in faith; if there is a lie, it is not faith. Now he says, "Son of David," and the man who confessed the name is commended and granted his request. He has not been reproved as a liar, but congratulated as a believer. (b) Therefore the One who granted sight to the blind for his calling upon the name was not without flesh. His being was real and not apparent, physically born of David's seed, of the holy Virgin Mary and through the Holy Spirit.

Scholion 52. Marcion falsified, "He took unto him the twelve and said, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written in the prophets concerning the Son of Man shall be accomplished. For he shall be delivered and killed, and the third day he shall rise again." He falsified this in its entirety.

Elenchus 52. To make sure that he would not be upright in anything and, not being upright, would be convicted of tampering in every way. For he concealed the lines to deny what is said of the passion, if you please. But since he later admits that Christ has been crucified, his labor of tampering (with the text) will be labor in vain for him.

Scholion 53. He falsified the section about the ass and Bethphage—and the one about the city and temple, because of the scripture, "My house shall be called an house of prayer, but ye make it a den of thieves."

(a) Elenchus 53. Wickedness does not see its own refutation, for it is blind. Marcion thinks he can conceal the road of the truth, but this is not possible. (b) For he jumped right over it, completely bypassing the sections we have mentioned because of their testimony that the temple site was Christ's and built in his name, and leaving out the entire passage about the journey from Jericho and how he got to Bethphage. For there actually was an ancient highway to Jerusalem by way of the Mount of Olives, and it was not unknown to those who also describe the temple site.

(d) But for his refutation out of his own mouth Marcion says, "It came to pass on one of those days, as he taught *in the temple*, they sought to lay hands on him and were afraid,"[171] as we read in next paragraph, 54. (e) How he got from Jericho to the temple will be learned from the journey itself and the length of the road. But this should make it plain that the crook concealed what happened on the road, and what the Savior himself

[171] Cf. Luke 20:19

said in the temple before this saying,[172] I mean (that he said), "My house shall be called an house of prayer"[173] and so on, as the prophecy runs.

Scholion 54. "And they sought to lay hands on him and they were afraid."

Elenchus 54. This was considered and expounded in the last elenchus, with the appropriately brief explanation.

Scholion 55. Again, he excised the material about the vineyard which was let out to husbandmen, and the verse, "What is this, then, The stone which the builders rejected?"

Elenchus 55. This will do us no harm. Even if he cut it out he did not cut if off from us, but caused a loss to himself and his followers. For there is ample refutation of him by a greater number of texts.

Scholion 56. He excised, "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, in calling the Lord the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob. But he is a God of the living, not of the dead."

(a) Elenchus 56. One can be amazed at the lame-brain's stupidity in not seeing that this testimony is equivalent to Lazarus the beggar's, and to the parable of those who are not allowed to enter the kingdom. He left the remains of these parables (in place) and did not falsify them; indeed, to his own embarrassment he has left "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."[174] (b) But if a finger is dipped in water after departure fom this life and a tongue is cooled with water—as the rich man said to Abraham on Lazarus' account—and there is gnashing of teeth and wailing, this is a sign of a resurrection of bodies, even if the oaf falsifies the Lord's true sayings about the resurrection of the dead.

Scholion 57. He did not have the following: "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed, saying that the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob is God of the living."

Elenchus 57. Since the Savior repeated the parable I have inserted it twice, so that I will not be like the tramp, Marcion, and leave any of the scriptures out. <But> the rejoinder to his tampering has been given already, in the elenchus just above.

Scholion 58. Again, he falsified, "There shall not an hair of your head perish"…(Elenchus 58 is missing.)

---

[172] I.e., "as he taught in the Temple." Marcion omits "My house shall be called a house of prayer."

[173] Matt 21:13

[174] Luke 13:28

Scholion 59. Again, he falsified the following: "Then let them which are in Judaea flee to the mountains" and so on, because of the words subjoined in the text, "until all things that are written be fulfilled."

(a) Elenchus 59. Because of his own forgetfulness he thinks that everyone is as stupid as he, and fails to realize that even if he leaves an unimportant text in place it serves for the exposure of the texts he has falsified, even though there are many of them. Thus nothing will keep anyone who wants to from comparing the things he acknowledges with these witnesses which he has falsified. (b) For it will be shown that <the words he left in place> in which, after his death, Abraham said, "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them,"[175] agree with these words that he has removed. What the prophets and Moses said came from God the Father, from the Lord himself the Son of God, and the Holy Spirit; and once written they had to be fulfilled.

Scholion 60. "He communed with the captains how he might deliver him unto them."

(a) Elenchus 60. What lunacy of Marcion's! Who "communed" but Judas? And to do what, but to "deliver" the Savior? And if the Savior is "delivered," the one who is "delivered" cannot be appearance, but is truth. If he was only a spirit, he was not delivered to men of flesh. As man, however, he had become tangible, <and> since he had put on flesh, willingly delivered himself into human hands.

(b) But they contradict themselves from stupidity. Indeed, I was arguing once with some of his disciples, some Marcionite or other, and remarking how it says in the Gospel that the Spirit took Jesus into the wilderness to be tempted by the devil. And he asked me, "How could Satan tempt the true God, who is both greater than he and, as you say, his Lord, Jesus his Master?"

(c) With God's help I received a flash of insight and answered him, "Don't you believe that Christ was crucified?"

"Yes," he said, and did not deny it.

"Who crucified him, then?"

"Men," he said.

(d) Then I said to him, "Who is more powerful—men, or the devil?" "The devil," he said.

But when he said this, I replied, "If the devil is more powerful than men, but men, who are weaker, crucified Christ, it's no wonder he was tempted

[175] Luke 16:29

by the devil too! (e) With entire willingness and under no necessity Christ has given himself for us, truly suffering, not from weakness but by choice, to set us an example, and <pay> the devil's claim for our salvation by his suffering of the cross, for the condemnation of sin and the abolition of death."

Scholion 61. "And he said unto Peter and the rest, Go and prepare that we may eat the Passover."

Elenchus 61. Marcion, the text contains a cloud of arrows aimed at you, all in one testimony. If he gives orders to prepare for him to eat the Passover, and the Passover was kept before Christ's suffering, it was surely because it was instituted by the Law. (b) But since Christ was living by the Law, it was plain that he did not come to destroy the Law, but to fulfill it. And if a king does not destroy a law, the commandment in the Law is neither profane nor abhorrent to the king. (c) But if, when the Law is sacred and the commandment in it is acknowledged to be such, a king should add something to the commandment as a greater gift, the splendor of the addition appears by his authority. Now since the legislation and the additional gift are those of one and the same king, it is clear to everyone, and plain, that the king who has made the addition is not opposed to the Law.

(d) Thus it has been proved that the Old Testament is in no way contrary to the Gospel or the succession of the prophets. But you have brought your refutation on yourself in many ways, Marcion—or rather, you have been compelled to by the truth itself. (e) The ancient Passover was nothing but the slaughter of a lamb and the eating of meat, the partaking of flesh meat with unleavened bread. And who but the truth itself—as I said—has kept you from suppressing your refutation altogether? For the Lord Jesus, with his disciples, has eaten these meat-dishes that you abhor, keeping the Passover as prescribed in the Law.

(f) And don't tell me that he was naming beforehand the mystery he was about to celebrate when he said, "I desire to eat the Passover with you."[176] To shame you in every way the truth does not place the mystery at the beginning, or you might deny it. It says, "*After supper* he took certain things and said, This is such and such,"[177] and left no room for tampering. For it made it plain that he went on to the mystery after eating the Jewish Passover, that is, "after supper."

Scholion 62. "And he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him, and he said, With desire I have desired to eat the Passover with you before I suffer."

---

[176] Luke 22:15

[177] Cf. Luke 22:20.

Elenchus 62. The Savior sat down, Marcion, and the twelve apostles sat down with him. If he "sat down" and they "sat down" with him, one expression cannot have two different meanings, even if it can be differentiated in its dignity and manner. For you must either admit that the twelve apostles have also sat down in appearance, or that he has really sat down because he really has flesh.

(b) And (he said), "With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer," to show that a Passover is already portrayed in the Law before his passion, both becoming the guarantee of his passion and calling forth something more perfect—showing too <that>, as the holy apostle also said, "The Law was our guardian until Christ." But if the Law is a guardian until Christ, the Law is not unrelated to Christ.

Scholion 63. He falsified, "I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God."

Elenchus 63. Marcion took this out and tampered with it, to avoid putting food or drink in the Kingdom of God, if you please. He was unaware, oaf that he is, that spiritual, heavenly things can correspond with the earthly, partaken of in ways that we do not know. (b) For the Savior testifies in turn, "Ye shall sit at my table, eating and drinking in the kingdom of heaven."

(c) Or again, he falsified these things to show, if you please, that the legislation in the Law has no place in the kingdom of heaven. Then why did Elijah and Moses appear with him on the mount in glory? But no one can accomplish anything against the truth.

Scholion 64. He falsified, "When I sent you, lacked ye anything?" and so on, because of the words, "This also that is written must be accomplished, And he was numbered among the transgressors."

Elenchus 64. Even if you falsify the words, the places they belong are evident from the fact, since the Law precedes them, the prophets foretell them, and the Lord fulfills them.

Scholion 65. "He was withdrawn from them about a stone's cast, and kneeled down and prayed/"

(a) Elenchus 65. When he knelt down he knelt visibly, and did it perceptibly. But if he did it perceptibly, then he performed the act of kneeling in the <human> manner. Therefore the Only-begotten did not sojourn among us without flesh. (b) For to him "every knee shall bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth"[178]—the knees of heavenly beings supernaturally, of earthly beings perceptibly, of those under the earth in their own fashion. But here he did everything in truth so as to be seen and touched by his disciples, and not to deceive.

[178] Phil 2:10

Scholion 66. "And Judas drew near to kiss him, and said…"

Elenchus 66. He drew near to a corporeal Master and a God who had taken a body, to kiss real lips, not apparent, pretended ones.

Scholion 67. He falsified what Peter did when he struck the servant of the high priest and cut off his ear.

(a) Elenchus 67. The cheat concealed what had actually happened, meaning to hide it out of deference to Peter, but (in fact) removing something that was said to the Savior's glorification. (b) But it will do no good; even though you excise them; we know the miracles of God. After the cutting off of the ear the Lord took it again and healed it, in proof that he is God and did God's work.

Scholion 68. "They that held him mocked him, smiting and striking him and saying, Prophesy, who is it that smote thee?"

Elenchus 68. That "they that held," "mocked," "smite," "strike," and "Prophesy, who is it that smote thee," was not appearance, but indicative of tangibility and physical reality, is plain to everyone, Marcion, even if you have gone blind and will not acknowledge God's plain truth.

Scholion 69. After "We found this fellow perverting the nation," Marcion added, "and destroying the Law and the prophets."

(a) Elenchus 69. How will you not be detected? How will you not be exposed as perverting the way of the Lord? For when, in order to slander yourself—I won't say, "the Lord"—you add something here that is not in the text <and> say, "We found this fellow destroying the Law and the prophets," the opposite of this will refute you, you expender of wasted effort, since the Savior himself says, "I came not to destroy the Law and the prophets, but to fulfill."[179] (b) Now the same person <who> says, "I came not to destroy," cannot be accused of destroying. For the text did not say this, but, "We found him perverting the nation, saying that he himself is Christ, a king."

Scholion 70. An addition after, "forbidding to give tribute," is, "and turning away their wives and children."

(a) Elenchus 70. Who will get himself out onto a cliff, in fulfillment of scripture's, "He that is evil to himself, to whom will he be good?" For falsifying something that is written, but adding something that is not, is an example of the utmost rashness, wickedness, and unsafe travel—especially in the Gospel, which is forever indestructible.

---

[179] Matt 5:17

(b) And the additions themselves have no place in the Gospel and contain no hidden meaning. Jesus did not turn wives or children away; he himself said, "Honor thy father and mother," and, "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder."

(c) But even though he did say, "Except a man leave father, and mother, and brethren, and wife, and children and the rest, he is not my disciple," this was not to make us hate our parents. It was to prevent our being led <to follow the teaching> of another faith at our fathers' and mothers' command, or to behavior contrary to the Savior's teaching.

Scholion 71. "And when they were come unto a place called Place of a Skull, they crucified him and parted his raiment, and the sun was darkened."

(a) Elenchus 71. Glory to the merciful God, who fastened your chariots together, Marcion, you Pharaoh, and though you hoped to escape, sank them in the sea! Though you make all possible excuses you will have none here. If a man has no flesh, neither can he be crucified.

(b) Why did you not evade this great text? Why did you not try to conceal this great event, which undoes all your evil which you have devised from the beginning? (c) If he was really crucified, why can you not see that the Crucified is tangible, and his hands and feet are fastened with nails? This could not be an apparition or phantom, as you say, but was truly a body which the Lord had taken from Mary—our actual flesh, bones, and the rest. For even in your teaching it is admitted that the Lord was nailed to a cross!

Scholion 72. Marcion removed the words, "Today thou shalt be with me in paradise."

(a) Elenchus 72. You removed this rightly and suitably, Marcion, for you have removed own entry into paradise. You will neither enter yourself nor allow your companions to enter. For by their very nature both deceivers and deceived hate what is good.

Scholion 73. "And when he had cried with a loud voice he gave up the ghost."

Elenchus 73. If he expired and gave a loud cry, Marcion, why did he expire, or what was it that was expired? But it is obvious, even if you deny it—his soul which, with his divine nature, had left the body, while the body remained lifeless, as the truth is.

Scholion 74. "And, lo, a man named Joseph took the body down, wrapped it in linen and laid it in a sepulchre that was hewn in stone."

Elenchus 74. If the removal, the wrapping, and the deposit in a rock-hewn tomb do not convince you, Marcion, who is a bigger fool than you?

What else that was plainer could scripture show when, to make the entire truth manifest, it exhibited the tomb, its location, what kind it was, the putting of the body there for three days, and the wrapper of the shroud?

Scholion 75. "And the women returned and rested the sabbath day according to the Law."

(a) Elenchus 75. Why did the women return? And why does the scripture say that they rested, Marcion, if not to give their witness which exposes your stupidity? (b) See here, women testify, apostles, Jews, angels—and Joseph, who took a real, tangible body down and wrapped it up! As scripture says, if a man has perverted himself to his own condemnation, who can put him to rights?[185]

Scholion 76. "The men in shining garments said, Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is risen; remember all that he spake when he was yet with you, that the Son of Man must suffer and be delivered."

(a) Elenchus 76. Not even these holy angels convince you, Marcion, though they confess that Christ has spent three days among the dead, and after that is alive, and dead no longer. (In his divine nature he is always alive, and was not put to death at all; but physically he had been put to death for the three days, and was alive again.) (b) For they tell the women, "He is risen; he is not here." And what does "He is risen" mean but that he also fell asleep? For they make it clearer: "Remember that while he was yet with you he told you these things, that the Son of Man must suffer."

Scholion 77. He falsified what Christ said to Cleopas and the other disciples when he met them, "O fools, and slow to believe all that the prophets have spoken. Ought not he to have suffered these things?" And instead of "what the prophets have spoken," he put, "what I have said unto you." But he is exposed, since "When he broke the bread their eyes were opened and they knew him."

Elenchus 77. Tell me, Marcion, how was the breaking of the bread done? In appearance, or with a solid body actually at work? For when he arose from the dead he truly arose in his sacred body itself; <therefore he truly broke the bread>.

(b) But you have replaced, "Is not this what the prophets have spoken?" Marcion, with, "Is this not what I said unto you?" (c) If he had told them, "*I* said unto you," they would surely have recognized him from the phrase, "I said." Why, then, is it at the breaking of the bread that scripture says, "Their eyes were opened and they knew him and he vanished?"

(d) For it was fitting for him, since he was God and was transforming his body into a spiritual one, to show that it was a true body but that it

vanished when he chose, since all things are possible to him. (e) Even Elisha, in fact, who was a prophet and had received the grace from God, prayed God that his pursuers be smitten with blindness, and they were smitten and could not see him as he was. (f) Moreover, in Sodom the angels concealed Lot's door, and the Sodomites could not see it. Was Lot's door an apparition too, Marcion? But you are left with no reply. For he plainly broke the bread and distributed it to his disciples.

Scholion 78. "Why are ye troubled? Behold my hands and my feet, for a spirit hath not bones as ye see me have."

(a) Elenchus 78. Who can fail to laugh at the driveler who has foolishly dragged himself and the souls of others down to hell? If he had not acknowledged these words his imposture would be plausible, and his dupes would be pardonable. (b) But now, since he acknowledged these texts and did not take them out, and his followers read them too, his sin and theirs remains and the fire is inescapable for him and them, since they have no excuse. For the Savior has clearly taught that <even after> his resurrection he has bones and flesh, as he testified himself with the words, "as ye see me have."

12,1 This is the publication of the treatise against Marcion based on the remains of the Gospel he preserves, which I have composed on his account and which, in my opinion, is adequate to expose his deceit. (2) But I shall also go on to the next part, the texts from the Apostle which he still preserves, and which I have, again, selected in the same way. I have put <the> ones from the Epistle to the Galatians first, and keep that order throughout, for in Marcion's canon Galatians stands first. (3) At the time I did not make my selection <in> his <order> but in the order of the Apostolic Canon, and put Romans first. But here I cite in accordance with Marcion's canon.

<From the Epistle to the Galatians>

Scholion 1. Learn that the just shall live by faith. For as many as are under the Law are under a curse; but, The man that doeth them shall live by them."

(a) Elenchus 1. The saying, "Learn that the just shall live by faith," as the apostle gives it is reference to an ancient scripture. Such things <have been taken over> by the apostle for our salvation, as statements from the Law and prophets (which are) about a new covenant and are conjoined with our hope. (b) And he says, "They are under a curse," because there was a threat in the Law against Adam's disobedience, until the One who had come from above arrived, clothed himself with a body made of Adam's clay, and changed the curse into a blessing.

Scholion 2. "Cursed is everyone that hangeth upon a tree; but he that is of the promise is by the freewoman."

Elenchus 2. Again, by showing that the provision of the incarnation and cross was made for the purpose of lifting the curse, and that it had been written in the Law first, and prophesied, and then fulfilled in the Savior, the holy apostle gave plain indication that the Law is not alien to the Savior. For it prophesied and witnessed to the things that were to be done by him.

Scholion 3. "I testify that a man that is circumcised is a debtor to do the whole Law."

Elenchus 3. He does not say "he is debtor" with regard to something that is forbidden, but with regard to a heavier burden which can be lightened. For there is one Master who is able both to burden and, of his free choice, to lighten the burden of those who have not refused to accept salvation through his grace at his coming in the flesh.

Scholion 4. In place of, "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump," he put, "corrupteth the whole lump."

Elenchus 4. So that there would be nothing true in his canon he has almost nowhere dealt with the scriptures without tampering with them. But the explanation of the saying comes from the analogy itself. Leaven, by its nature, is a product of a lump and leavening comes from the lump; and a person drawing the analogy of the symbol intelligently would not do away with the nature in the original terms.

Scholion 5. "For all the Law is fulfilled by you; thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Elenchus 5. What use would the holy apostle have for practicing the Law if the New Testament had been separated from the ancient legislation? But to show that the two Testaments are testaments of the one God, and that their agreement <as to> the possibility of fulfilling the Law by the love of neighbor, which does perfect good, is made equally known in the two Testaments, he said that love is the fulfillment of the Law.

Scholion 6. "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, factions, envyings, drunkenness, revelings—of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God."

(a) Elenchus 6. What marvelous mysteries the precepts of God's <apostle> are—the opposite of <the tramp's imposture>! For Marcion attributed everything dreadful to the flesh. But flesh was not always in existence; the flesh <came into being> on the sixth day of creation, with

the fashioning of Adam. It had its origin from that time, I mean the time of Adam's fashioning, to confound those who say that evil is everlasting and primordial.

(b) Nor, in fact, did the flesh sin from the time of its fashioning, or its Fashioner might be held responsible for sin, because he had fashioned the flesh as a sinful thing. Neither did evil pre-exist the thing God had fashioned. Adam fell into disobedience later on, and <as> a free agent deliberately committed the sin against himself by his own choice, I mean (the sin of) breaking faith with his Master through disobedience. (c) Where, then, was evil before there was flesh? And why did the flesh not do evil as soon as it was fashioned, but later on? And that disposes of what is said about the origin of evil! Evil cannot be primordial, since whether it is done or not is up to the flesh, whose origin came later. Nor, in turn, is the flesh without an inheritance in the heavens.

(d) And let no one seize hold of the holy apostle's words, "Flesh and blood shall not inherit the kingdom of God";[180] he is not censuring all flesh. How can the flesh be accused which has not done these things? (e) But let me make the point with other proofs as well. For Paul says, "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?"[181] How can the holy Mary not inherit the kingdom of heaven, flesh and all, when she did not commit fornication or uncleanness or adultery or do any of the intolerable deeds of the flesh, but remained undefiled? (f) Therefore Paul does not mean that flesh cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven, but means carnal men who do evil with the flesh—fornication, idolatry and the like. (g) And your villainy has been exposed by every method, you misguided Marcion, since the truth has anticipated you everywhere, and safeguards the trustworthiness of the message of life.

Scholion 7. "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts."

(a) Elenchus 7. If they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh too, Marcion, it is plainly in imitation of Christ that Christ's servants have made the flesh, with its affections and lusts, clean—showing that he himself has crucified flesh. Therefore they too have crucified the flesh, with the same intent as their Master. (b) And if they have crucified the flesh, it is inconceivable that flesh which has suffered for Christ does not reign with Christ, as the holy apostle indicates elsewhere, "As ye are partakers of the sufferings of Christ, so shall ye be also of the glory."

---

[180] 1 Cor 15:50
[181] Rom 8:33

Scholion 8. "For neither do they themselves who are circumcised (now) keep the Law."

(a) Elenchus 8. Thus the former circumcision had not been forbidden in its own day, if it kept the Law. But the Law announced that Christ would come to provide a law of liberty, and in Christ's time physical circumcision would no longer serve. For the true circumcision through Christ, of which it was a type, has come.

(b) And even if they who are still marked by the earlier circumcision keep the whole Law, this will no longer count for them as observance of the Law. For the Law said of Christ that "The Lord God will raise up unto you a prophet, of my brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken."[182] But since they have not hearkened to Christ "Circumcision is made uncircumcision unto them" and their observance of the Law is no longer observance.

(c) The Law is good, then, and circumcision is good, since from the Law and circumcision we have come to know Christ, his more perfect Law, and his more perfect circumcision.

From the <First> Epistle to the Corinthians, for this is their second Epistle and ours.

Scholion 1 and 9. "For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to naught the understanding of the prudent."

Elenchus 1 and 9. If the apostle culls evidence in proof of truth and good doctrine from the things that are written in the prophets, the prophets are not foreign to the truth, the good God, and his good doctrine.

Scholion 2 and 10. "That, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord."

(a) Elenchus 2 and 10. If a person who glories in the Lord is praiseworthy in the prophet's writings but knows the God of the Law as Lord—the God you call judge, Marcion, and demiurge, and just—then this God is none other than the Father of Christ, whose disciple Paul is. (b) For from the prophet's teaching, Paul, who was appointed by Christ as teacher of the gentiles, drew pure water, as it were, from teachings like these and from these very teachings, and watered the church which was entrusted to him.

Scholion 3 and 11. "of the first beings of this world, that come to naught."

(a) Elenchus 3 and 11. If there are many "first beings" (ἄρχοντες) of this world, Marcion, and if such beings are going to come to naught, you

[182] Deut 18:15

will be forced to give up your search for the roots of three first principles (ἀρχαί) but to hunt for another myth of many principles, many roots and much melodrama. (b) And when you make one up by quibbling—for you can't find one (ready-made)—the words, "that come to naught," will confront you. And your imaginary root of the first principles, which has no first principle of its own, will be demolished by the words of the author who said, "that come to naught."

For whatever comes to an end is not eternal; if it had a beginning, it will have to have an end as well. (c) It is impossible for anything that has a beginning to be everlasting unless the Existent should will it—the Cause of that which once did not exist, but had a beginning of existence. Now "the Existent" is Father, Son and Holy Spirit; the non-existent are all created things, which have had a beginning of existence. Among these is that which is called, and is, evil, which began with men, who came into existence but at one time did not exist. But since evil began at the same time that man <began>, who once did not exist, <there will also be a time> when evil will no longer exist. (d) It will undoubtedly be eliminated, since the Existent does not consent to a thing that had a beginning and then placed itself among evil things. For it will be brought to an end after the resurrection. And not only then. It has been brought to an end since the proclamation of the Law—and even before the Law by many who have lived by the law of nature, and still more, surely, since Christ's incarnation.

(e) But it will be ended entirely after the resurrection of the dead, since "They are sown in corruption, they are raised in incorruption,"[183] doing evil no longer, dying no longer. (f) And that it will be ended the same saying of the apostle, "The first beings of this world *that come to naught*," will testify. And the case you have made has been demolished in every way, Marcion, since it is imaginary, false, shaky and irrational.

Scholion 4 and 12. "For it is written, He taketh the wise in their own craftiness." And again, "The Lord knoweth the thoughts of men, that they are vain."

Elenchus 4 and 12. "It is written," which introduces a citation, and the corresponding "The Lord knoweth," are not strange to the person who selected the words of the saying—I mean the holy apostle, in whose writings the citation is found. And from this citation it will be evident that the character of the apostle's preaching is not different from that of the Old Testament from which he got his text.

[183] 1 Cor 15:42

Scholion 5 and 13. "For even Christ our Passover is sacrificed."

(a) Elenchus 5 and 13. If the apostle acknowledges a Passover and does not deny that Christ was sacrificed, the Passover is not foreign to Christ, who truly, not in appearance, sacrifices a lamb for a Passover, as the Law prescribes. Of this lamb Christ, who was not sacrificed (only) in appearance and did not suffer without flesh, is a type. (b) For how could a spirit be sacrificed? It is plain <that>that it could not.

But since he could not have been sacrificed without flesh, and yet—as is acknowledged by the apostle's undoubted testimony—he was truly sacrificed, <it is plain that he had clothed himself with flesh>. (c) Therefore it is plainly proven on all counts that the Law was not foreign to him. The Law was temporarily in force as a type until the coming of Christ, the more perfect and manifest Lamb, who was sacrificed in truth—the Lamb which the actual lamb which was sacrificed in ancient times anticipated. But as "our Passover, Christ was sacrificed."

Scholion 6 and 14. "Know ye not that he which is joined to an harlot is one body? For two, saith he, shall be one flesh."

Elenchus 6 and 14. If the Law is not true, why do truthful persons take the testimonies from the Law? One of them is God's holy apostle Paul, who took this text, together with many others, in manifest proof of truth, and of the proclamation of the good God.

Scholion 7 and 15. Given in an altered form. In place of, "in the Law," he says, "in the Law of Moses." But before this he says, "Or saith not the Law the same also?"

(a) Elenchus 7 and 15. Even if you change the form in the second expression, Marcion, and think that by your having written, "in the Law of Moses," you have separated the Law from God by means of that "Moses," the union (of the two texts) just before this refutes your foolishness—(that is, the union of) "Or saith not the Law the same also?" (with) "For it is written in the Law, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn."[184] (b) No matter if you added Moses' name you have done us no harm, but have helped us by tying the evidence against yourself together at every point and unwittingly admitting, through the phrases, "in the Law of Moses," and, "the Law saith," that the Law of Moses is God's Law.

(c) For the apostle goes on in agreement with this by saying in the next sentence, "Doth God take care for oxen? Or saith he it altogether for our sakes?" But if the Law has spoken for the apostles' sakes then, likewise,

---

[184] 1 Cor 9:8-9, ἢ καὶ ὁ νόμος ταῦτα οὐ λέγει; ἐν γὰρ τῷ Μωϋσέως νόμῳ γέγραπται· οὐ κημώσεις βοῦν ἀλοώντα.

the God who spoke in the Law is looking after Christ's apostles by ordering that they not be "muzzled"—either so that they may teach the doctrine of Christ himself, or so that they may receive their daily bread from the people without fear. He therefore does not know the apostles to be foreign to his own Godhead; nor do the apostles regard him as a foreign God.

(d) By this Godhead's inspiration the holy apostle has given the testimony of all creatures through saying, "Doth God take care for oxen? But for the apostles' sakes hath he spoken." And if God has spoken for the apostles' sakes, and yet he is the creator of men and beasts, including oxen and sparrows, reptiles and insects, fish and the rest—then he is concerned for all, each in its own proportion.

(e) And he is taking care for all when he says, "Thou, Lord, shalt save both man and beast";[185] "Who provideth for the raven his food?"[186] "The young of the ravens cry to the Lord, seeking their meat";[187] and, "Thou shalt give to all their meat in due season."[188] But he did not forbid the muzzling of a threshing ox while the oxen are in the act of threshing, since this would show that God cannot feed his creature otherwise than with the fodder men provide for their cattle. (f) The holy apostle showed that it was not for lack of fodder that God provided for oxen through the thresher by forbidding him to muzzle his oxen, but by the figurative language about the apostles indicated their relation (to this).

(g) For truly, God manifestly makes provision for all and is concerned for all alike. For the holy apostle was not writing in contradiction of the Savior, to give the rabble an excuse of that sort. (h) Sparrows are less important than oxen, and of them the Savior said, "Five sparrows are sold for two farthings,"[189] and again, "Are not two sparrows sold for one farthing?"[190] Therefore, if two sparrows are sold for one farthing, and one will not fall into a snare without your heavenly Father, God provides for all alike, but cares for his more important creatures by the more important mode, that of spiritual reasoning. (i) Hence there is entire agreement that the same God is Maker, Demiurge, and Law-giver in Old and New Testaments, a good God and a just, and Lord of all.

---

[185] Ps 35:7
[186] Job 38:41
[187] Job 38:41
[188] Ps 194:15
[189] Luke 12:6
[190] Matt 10:29

Scholion 8 and 16. I have already dealt fully with this, and expounded it at length, in the preceding paragraph. Hence I consider it superfluous to speak of it again, and am content with what has been said.

Scholion 9 and 17. "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant how that all our fathers were under the cloud and all passed through the sea, and did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink. For they drank of a spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ. But with many of them God was not well pleased. Now these things were our examples, to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted. Neither be ye idolaters as were some of them; as it is written, The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play. Neither let us tempt Christ," until the words, "These things happened unto them for examples, and they were written for us," and so on.

(a) Elenchus 9 and 17. Such madness! When the sun is rising, what person who has eyes will wander away from the light? If the holy apostle says that the men of those days were his fathers and were under a cloud and passed through the sea, that there is both a spiritual meat and a spiritual drink, and that they have eaten and drunk from a spiritual rock that followed them, but the rock was Christ—(b) (if that is what he says), who will believe the stupidity of Marcion who befogs his own mind and the minds of his followers by claiming that Christ is unrelated to the events in the Law, which the apostle admits took place in reality and not in appearance.

(c) But the apostle says that Christ was not pleased with most of them, surely because of their unlawful behavior. But if he was not pleased with people who did things which were unlawful in terms of the Law, then he was angry with such people in his capacity as Giver of the Law, and he is teaching that the Law is his, that it was given for a time, and that it served a legitimate purpose until his incarnation. For it is proper for a householder to give his staff, at each particular time, the orders that are appropriate for it.

(d) But he adds at once, "These things were our examples, that we might not lust after evil things as they also lusted. Neither be ye idolaters, as were *some* of them"—not extending the sentence to them all. (e) And how do you know this, Paul? He replies by saying, "As it is written, The people sat down to eat and drink and rose up to play." So, then, the written scripture from which the apostle also takes his verdict against the lawbreakers, is true.

(f) Then again, "Neither let us tempt the Lord." But Marcion put "Christ" in place of "Lord." "Lord" and "Christ" are the same even if Marcion doesn't think so, since Christ's name has already been set down where

it is said, "The rock was Christ, yet with many of them he was not well pleased."

(g) Again, when he is expounding the whole purpose of the passage the holy apostle says, "These things happened unto them for examples, and were written for our admonition." Now if the things that happened to them as examples were written for our admonition, the One who wrote for our admonition about the events that took place then, was looking after us whose admonition he was composing, so that we would not become desirous of evils. (h) But if he does not want us to be desirous of evils, then he is good, not evil. For he urges us to be in the same state as he, this same good God, who is likewise just—God of those who were written about earlier and of those who are admonished later, Creator of all, Demiurge, Lawgiver, Giver of the Gospels and Guide of the Apostles.

Scholion 10 and 18. "What say I, then? That sacred meat is anything, or that meat offered in sacrifice to idols is anything? But the things which they sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons and not to God." But Marcion added, "sacred meat."

(a) Elenchus 10 and 18. "What say I, then? Is meat offered in sacrifice to idols anything? But the things which they sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons and not to God." In saying that those who sacrifice to idols sacrifice to demons, not God, the apostle did not disown the ancient time of the fathers which extended till his time, while Jerusalem stood. (b) Therefore he was not condemning those who sacrificed to God while there was a need for sacrifices. But he does condemn those who sacrifice to idols—not for sacrificing, but for sacrificing to idols instead of God. (Nor do they sacrifice to prepare for eating the food God has granted them. They are sacrificing to demons and <rendering service> to nonsense.)

(c) But you added "sacred meat" (ἱερόθυτον), Marcion, thinking that, by confusing the two terms, "sacred" (ἱερός) and "idol", you could make the nature of the two (types of sacrifice) into one. And this is not the case. (d) If sacrifice was being offered specifically to Christ after the coming of the new covenant, and animals were being sacrificed in his name, then your sophistical falsehood would have proved persuasive, on the grounds that those who sacrifice to God now were sacrificing to Christ, whereas those who sacrificed then in the temple at Jerusalem, and those who sacrifice to idols, were lumped together and would be sacrificing to demons, not God. But as no one has sacrificed animals to Christ since the advent of Christ and the new covenant, the addition in your text is obvious.

(e) But even if the language about "sacred meat" and "meat offered to idols" actually stood in the Apostle, they would be taken as one and the same by persons of sound reason. The expression would be used carelessly

by the apostle because of the habit of people who always called the idol "sacred."

(f) And your false notion has collapsed in every way, since the truth has been established that those who sacrifice to idols—whether what they did or do <is called> "sacred meat" as they say, <or "sacrifice to idols">—are <still> acting a lie and sacrificing to demons, not God. But (this is) not (true of) those who once sacrificed with perfect propriety in accordance with the Law.

(g) But now that this is no longer done[191]—by his will, as he said even from the first through the prophet Jeremiah, "To what purpose dost thou bring to me incense from Sheba and sweet cane from a far country?" and again, "Thy sacrifices are not sweet unto me";[192] and elsewhere, "Take away thy sacrifices, O Israel, and eat flesh. For I gave your fathers no commandment concerning sacrifices in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, but this thing I commanded them, that every man deal justly with his neighbor."[193]

(h) But when the same God who said, "I gave no such commandment," also said to Moses, in the Law, "If any man of the children of Israel shall offer a sacrifice of the beeves or of the sheep, let him offer a male without blemish"[194]—and again, "If any sin and be overcome by a transgression, let him offer a sheep"; and again, "If the people sin, let them offer a calf"—[195] he showed that he willingly accepted the sacrifices which once were offered for the people's salvation, not because he needed or wanted them, but in deference to their weakness and people's preconception, to divert men's minds from polytheism to the knowledge of the one God. (i) For since their minds had been firmly set on the sacrifice which, as though in piety, they were offering to idols for their own atonements and salvation, he willed that, lest they feel any distress because of their habituation, they transfer their customary practices to himself—to wean them away from them <by allowing> them to do this in his name for a while, rather than in the names of an imaginary pantheon. Then finally, when they had learned to know the One and come to believe firmly in the One, he would tell them, "Do I eat bulls' flesh or drink the blood of goats?"[196] and, "Did ye offer unto

---

[191] μηκέτι τούτου γενομένου. In the long series of quotations which make up this passage, Epiph loses sight of his main verb.

[192] Jerem 6:20

[193] Jerem 7:21-23

[194] Cf. Lev 22:18-19.

[195] Cf. Lev 5:17-18 and 4:13-14.

[196] Ps 49:3

me sacrifice in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel?"[197]—though many sacrifices were offered then, surely—(k) to show that they were not offering to him, though he accepted this and they were offering in his name. (He accepted it) because of their inherited custom in such matters, until he could undermine it by drawing them away from their customary worship of many gods to the One, and from the One they could finally learn that he had not needed and did not need sacrifices; (l) and at last he would remove the entire reason for the sacrifices through the incarnation of Christ himself. For the one sacrifice has put an end to all the previous ones—the sacrifice of Christ, that is, for, as the scripture says, "As our Passover, Christ is sacrificed."[198] Of this Sacrifice, Passover and teaching the Law became a guardian; for because of the type, it led and brought them back to the more perfect teaching.

Scholion 11 and 19. "A man ought not to have long hair, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God."

Elenchus 11 and 19. The apostle not only declares man to be God's image, but to be God's glory as well. And by representing the hair as physical—for it grows specifically on the body, not the soul—he declares, through his acknowledgment of things from the Old Testament which are applied in the New, that this created thing is therefore not unrelated to the good God.

Scholion 12 and 20. "But God hath compounded the body."

Elenchus 12 and 20. If "God" (ὁ θεός) has compounded the body, the apostle is preaching no other God than the true God. And if he confesses that "God" has compounded the body by means of its members, he knows no other "God" than the Demiurge himself, he who is good, creator and just, the maker of all. Of all these works of his one is man, well compounded by him by means of his members.

Scholion 13 and 21. Marcion has erroneously added the words, "on the Law's account," <after> "Yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding."

(a) Elenchus 13 and 21. Thus the languages too are by the gift of the Spirit. But what sort of languages does the apostle mean? <He says, "languages in the church,"> to show <those who> preened themselves on the sounds of Hebrew, which are well and wisely diversified in every expression, in various complex ways—on the pretentious kind of Greek,

[197] Amos 5:25
[198] 1 Cor 5:7

moreover, the speaking of Attic, Aeolic and Doric—<that God does not permit just one language in church, as some of the people <supposed> who had stirred up the alarms and factions among the Corinthians, to whom the Epistle was being sent.

(b) And yet Paul agreed that both using the Hebrew expressions and teaching the Law is <a gift> of the Spirit. Moreover, to condemn the other, pretentious forms of Greek, he said he spoke with "tongues" rather (than those) because he was an Hebrew of Hebrews and had been brought up at the feet of Gamaliel; and he sets great store by the scriptures of these Hebrews , and <makes it clear> that they are gifts of the Spirit. Thus, in writing to Timothy about the same scriptures, he said, "For from thy youth thou hast learned the sacred scriptures."[199]

(c) And further, he said the same sort of thing <to> the people who had been trained by the Greek poets and orators, and added in the same way, "I speak with tongues more than ye all,"[200] to show that he was more fully versed in the Greek education as well. (d) Even his style shows that he was educated, since Epicureans and Stoics could not withstand him <when he preached the Gospel with wisdom at Athens>, but were defeated by the inscription on the altar, "To the unknown God," which he read learnedly—which was read literally by him, and immediately paraphrased as "Whom ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you."[201] (e) And (they were defeated) again when he said, "A prophet of their own hath said, Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies,"[202] meaning Epimenides, who was an ancient philosopher and erected the idol in Crete. Callimachus the Libyan also extended his testimony to himself by quoting Callimachus and saying falsely of Zeus:

> The men of Crete are liars alway, Lord;
> 'Twas men of Crete that built thy tomb, though thou
> Hast never died; thy being is eternal

(f) And yet you see how the holy apostle explains of languages, "Yet in church I had rather utter five words with my understanding," that is, "in translation." As a prophet benefits his hearers with prophecy in the Holy Spirit by bringing things to light which have already been furnished to

---

[199] 2 Tim 3:15
[200] 1 Cor 14:18
[201] Acts 17:23
[202] Tit 1:12

his understanding, I too, says Paul, <want> to speak so that the church may hear and be edified—not edify myself with the boast of Greek and Hebrew which I know, instead of edifying the church with the language which it understands.

(g) But you have added, "on the Law's account," Marcion, as though the apostle meant, "I want <to speak> (no more than) five words in church on the Law's account." Shame on you, you second Babylon and new rabble of Sodom! How long are you going to confuse the tongues? How long will you venture against beings you cannot harm? For you are attempting to violate angelic powers by expelling the words of the truth from the church and telling the holy Lot, "Bring the men out!"[203]

(h) And yet your attempt is an attempt on yourself. You will not expel the words of the truth, but you will strike yourself blind and pass your life in utter darkness—fumbling for the door and not finding it, till the sun rises and you see the day of judgment, on which the fire will confront your falsehood also. For this is waiting for you, when you see. (i) "On the Law's account" is not in the apostle, and you have made it up yourself. But even if the apostle were to say, "on the Law's account," he would be saying it, in harmony with his own Lord, not in order to destroy the Law but to fulfil it.

Scholion 14 and 22. "In the Law it is written, With men of other tongues and other lips will I speak unto this people."

(a) Elenchus 14 and 22. "If the Lord did not fulfill the things that had previously been said in the Law, why would the apostle need to mention things from the Law which are fulfilled in the New Testament? Thus the Savior showed that it was he himself who had spoken in the Law even then, and threateningly declared to them, "Therefore was I grieved with this generation and said, They do always err in their hearts, and I sware that they shall not enter into my rest."[204] For the same reason he promised to speak to them through men of other tongues—as indeed he did, and they did not enter. (b) For we find him saying this to his disciples: "Unto you are given the mysteries of the kingdom, but unto them in parables, that seeing they may not see,"[205] and so on. Hence (if) the Old Testament sayings (are) fulfilled everywhere in the New, it is plain to everyone that the two Testaments are not Testaments of two different Gods, but of the same God.

---

[203] Gen 19:5
[204] Ps 94:10-11
[205] Mark 4:11-12

Scholion 15 and 23. "Let your women keep silence in the church; For it is not permitted unto them to speak, but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the Law."

(a) Elenchus 15 and 23. If God's holy apostle enjoins good order on God's holy church on the Law's authority, then the Law from which he took the good order is not disorderly; nor is it the law of a foreign God because it subjected wife to husband. For this was satisfactory to the apostle too in his legislation for the church—as he says, "as also saith the Law."

(b) And where did the Law say so, but when God said at once to Eve, "Thy resort shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee?" For even though it is also found in other passages the original statement of it is here. (c) Now if the wife was declared subject to the husband from then on by God's ordinance—and if the apostle subjects her accordingly, and not in disagreement with the God who made husband and wife, then the apostle too, by commanding it, shows decisively that he is a lawgiver for the same God to whom both the Law and the whole Old Testament belong, and that the New Testament is the same God's as well—that is, the two Testaments, which then and now subjected wife to husband for the sake of an equivalent godly order.

Scholion 16 and 24. On resurrection of the dead: "Brethren, I make known unto you the Gospel ye believed…that Christ died, and was buried, and rose again on the third day…When this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory."

(a) Elenchus 16 and 24. "Brethren, I make known unto you the Gospel which I preached unto you." If he has preached it and is making it known again, it is not a different Gospel or a different knowledge, subsequent to the one knowledge and the one Gospel which is one throughout the four Gospels and the Apostles—to the shame of Marcion who arrived so many years later, after the time of Hyginus, the ninth bishop of Rome in succession after the perfecting of the apostles Peter and Paul.[206] (b) And so, since he knew by the Holy Spirit that Marcion and his kind would twist the road whose foundation had been properly laid, the same holy apostle secured it by saying, "Though we, or an angel, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which ye have received, let him be accursed."[207] (c) This is why he no longer said, "I am preaching the Gospel to you," but, "I am

[206] Cf. Iren. 3.4.2-3.
[207] Gal 1:8

making the Gospel known to you"—not a different one, but the one I have preached to you already, of which I am now reminding you. "I am making it known to you for the same reason that I preached it to you, if you hold fast to it, unless you have believed in vain. For unless you hold it fast as I preached it to you, you have believed in vain apart from it."

(d) "For I preached to you that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures." Not in accordance with a a myth, or in accordance with the teaching of those who, of their own motion, are going to say things that are not in scripture. For the Jews, of their own motion say that he has not risen; and Marcion and the rest, that he has suffered and been buried in appearance. But I am giving you assurance in accordance with the scriptures.

(e) For he adds immediately, "So we preached, and so ye believed, that Christ died, and was buried, and rose the third day"; and in the same breath, "If the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised. And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain." (f) And after all this, "For this mortal must put on immortality, and this corruptible must put on incorruption."[208] And he did not say that this mortal contains immortality, or that this corruptible contains incorruption, but that the mortal and corruptible puts on immortality and incorruption. (g) And what is "mortal" but the body, which does not merely contain immortality in itself but is fit for immortality and is to put in on—not with the body discarded and immortality put on by the soul which cannot die, but with the mortal putting on immortality and the corruptible—that is, the body—putting on incorruption?

For there is both a death and a temporary decay of the body because of the dissolution which was brought upon it by Adam's disobedience. (h) But because he is speaking of the benefits which will be brought to fulfillment in it, Paul, through his promise, indicates their coming fulfillment by saying, "Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory," meaning the resurrection of the dead which will take place at that time. For death was swallowed up in part by the resurrection of Christ and those who arose with him—"For many bodies of the saints arose and went into the holy city,"[209] as the Gospel says. But then it will be swallowed up in victory, when it disappears altogether from everyone.

From the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. This stands third in Marcion but in an altered way, since in his canon Galatians is placed first.

---

[208] 1 Cor 15:53
[209] Matt 27:52-53

Scholion 1 and 25. "For all the promises of God have their Yea in him; therefore through him we utter the Amen to God."

(a) Elenchus 1 and 25. Open your eyes, Marcion, and be saved! But if you no longer can—for you have died—let your dupes open their eyes and escape from you, as from a dreadful serpent which injures any who come near it. (b) For if "All the promises of God have their Yea in him," but the apostle knows God's promises through the Law and the prophets, then the Yea of the promises' fulfillment was surely confirmed in Christ. (c) Hence Christ is not alien to the ancient Law and the prophets, or to the God who spoke in the Law and has fulfilled his promises in Christ!

Nor is Christ opposed to the God who has given the Law and the prophets. (d) For the reason. Paul says, why the Amen is also uttered to God through Christ, is that the promises which were made become Yea through him. For it is God the Father who promised but Christ who confirms, and the Amen proper is secured through him in those who are confirmed by his promise, and who have recognized his Father as the God who spoke in the Law and has given deliverance, in the Gospel, to those who believe. It is they who say, through Christ who himself is saying it, "Yea, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight."[210]

Scholion 2 and 26. "For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord and ourselves your servants through Jesus. For it is God who said, Out of darkness shall light shine."

(a) Elenchus 2 and 26. The apostles do not preach themselves, but Christ Jesus, as Lord. Therefore there can be no sect or church named for the apostles. We have never heard of Petrists, Paulians, Bartholomaeans, or Thaddaeans; from the first we have heard one message, the message of all the apostles, (b) which proclaims not themselves but Christ Jesus as Lord. This is why they all gave one name for the church—not their own name but the name of their Lord Jesus Christ, since they were first called Christians at Antioch. This is the only catholic church, having no <name> but that of Christ. It is a church of Christians—not of Christs but of Christians, since Christ is one, and they are named Christians after the one Christ. (c) But all <the sects sprouted up> after this church and its messengers—no longer of the same character <but>, from their given names of, Manichaeans, Simonians, Valentinians, Ebionites—plainly <foreign to it>. You too are one of those, Marcion, and your dupes have been given your name because you preached yourself, not Christ.

---

[210] Matt 11:26

(d) He says next, "For God who said, Out of darkness light shall shine." But which "God" if not the one God who brought light out of darkness in the prophet? That is, in place of human unbelief and ignorance he caused light and knowledge to shine, in Christ, in the hearts of us who were once idolatrous gentiles, but <have> now <come to know> the God who promised then in the prophet that his light would shine in the world—and who thus is not foreign to the Old and New Testaments. I have kept trying to convince you of this, Marcion, from the written remains of the Gospel which you have in your possession, and not be taken in by you.

Scholion 3 and 27. "We, having the same Spirit of faith, also believe and therefore speak." But he excised "according as it is written."

(a) Elenchus 3 and 27. Whatever ventures you may make you will not be given an opening. Even if you excise "according as it is written," the consequences of the words that used to be written are plain. (b) After, "I believed, and therefore have I spoken," the apostle immediately added the exact equivalent and said, "We, having the same Spirit of faith, likewise believe and therefore speak." (c) But it is plain to everyone that the line beginning, "I believed <and therefore have I spoken>" is written in the Hundred Fifteenth Psalm, one which has the Alleluia superscription and is part of David's roll and a prophecy of his own. (d) So the apostle took the text and likewise, speaking as one of the apostles, said, "Therefore we also believe and speak." (He said, not "Therefore *I* believed and spoke," but, "*We* believe, therefore we speak," to link himself with the other apostles.)

(e) And he says, "having the same Spirit" to show that the Spirit which spoke in David is the same Spirit which is in the apostles. The Spirit by whose inspiration David believed when he prophesied is the Spirit in which they too believe and speak.

(f) But the injustice and, one might say, the greed of <the tramp's> sick ideas is great. For since Paul maintains that the Spirit is one and the same, how can Marcion's stupidity, which admits that the holy apostle has said this, dare to say that there was one Spirit then, and another which was in the apostles?

From the Epistle to the Romans, Epistle Four, for this is where it stands in Marcion, thus making certain that he can get nothing right.

Scholion 1 and 28. "As many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the Law shall be judged by the Law. For not the hearers of the Law are just before God, but the doers of the Law shall be justified."

(a) Elenchus 1 and 28. If as many as sinned without law will also perish without law, then the Law, when kept, is conducive of salvation and does

not permit those who keep it to perish. And if those who sinned by the Law will be judged by the Law, then the Law is judge of their transgressions; though it is not a Law of destruction but of righteous judgment, judging the transgressors in holiness.

(b) "For not the hearers of the Law are just before God, but the doers of the Law shall be justified." If the Law, when kept, justifies the person who keeps it, then the Law on account of which those who keep the Law are constituted righteous, is not unrighteous or bad. (c) But from the Law is derived its prophetically proclaimed faith in Christ, without whom no one can be justified and again, by believing in whom no one can be justified if he believes differently than the testimony which is prophetically given by the Law. For Christ is the fulfillment of the Law as is said in the Apostle: "Christ is the fulfillment of the Law for justification,"[211] to show that there can be no righteousness without the Law and Christ. (d) For neither will the Jews, who have not received Christ, be justified without Christ; nor will you be justified, Marcion, since you deny the Law.

Scholion 2 and 29. "Circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the Law; but if thou be a breaker of the Law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision."

Elenchus 2 and 29. If the holy apostle declares that circumcision will be beneficial, who can cast aspersions on things that are beneficial unless he is going to behave like the serpent? For you are like the serpent, Marcion; it too, turning what God had said around, misled Eve by saying, "Ye shall certainly not die!"[212]

(b) For Paul linked Law with circumcision, showed that circumcision was appropriate to the Law, and declared it to be the ordinance of the same God who had once given circumcision and the Law for our assistance. And when Christ is believed on the Law's authority, he enables the believers to say and do what is perfect.

Scholion 3 and 30. "Which hast the form of knowledge and of the truth in the Law."

Elenchus 3 and 30. If knowledge has a form, and the nature of a thing is apparent from its form, but the apostles and their disciples, who have the knowledge and the truth, have acquired the nature, that is, the knowledge and the truth, from the form of the Law, then the Law is not foreign to the

[211] Cf. Rom 10:4
[212] Gen 3:4

knowledge and the truth. For through the form in the Law the messengers of the truth came to know the knowledge and truth.

Scholion 4 and 31. "For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly."

(a) Elenchus 4 and 31. The words "yet" and "died" are not indicative of appearance but of reality. If Christ was an appearance what need was there for "yet" to be said—when Christ could have been manifest in appearance at any time, then and now, without any need to say, "while we were yet without strength." (b) For his death *then* <is evident> from the word "yet", (the death) <by which he paid in full what was owed for us> and justified us by that death, so that he has no further need to die. For he died once for sinners, and need not die any more on his own account.

Scholion 5 and 32. "Wherefore the Law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good."

Elenchus 5 and 32. Paul assents to the holiness of the Law and of the commandment which was given in it, and by calling this commandment holy, just and good, has certified it with three witnesses—to refute you, Marcion, and teach us that it is the Law of the holy One whose commandment is also holy, and that he is himself the holy and good (God). (b) Therefore, as the commandment of a good God, it is called good; as the commandment of a holy God, it is called holy; as the commandment of a just God, it is called just. For he who <proclaims it> then and now—he who is holy, just and good—is one. Therefore his commandment then and now, in the Law and in the New Testament, is also holy, just and good.

Scholion 6 and 33. "That the requirement of the Law might be fulfilled in us."

Elenchus 6 and 33. If the requirement of the Law is fulfilled in the apostles and in us, Marcion, how dare you call the Law foreign to God's apostles, who are justified in accordance with their fulfilment of the Law?

Scholion 7 and 34. "For Christ is the fulfillment of the Law for righteousness to everyone that believeth."

(a) Elenchus 7 and 34. If Christ has come for righteousness for all who believe, while the Law cannot be fulfilled unless Christ fulfills it by his coming, you will not be perfected, you Jews, by remaining in the Law, unless you believe and accept the Christ who has come. (b) But neither can you be saved in Christ, Marcion, since you reject the first principle and root of the proclamation, which is the Law from which Christ is known and which perfects one who does not despise the Law as alien to Christ

Scholion 8 and 35. "He that loveth his neighbor hath fulfilled the Law."

Elenchus 8 and 35. If the Law is fulfilled by the love of neighbor, then the Law, which commands the love of neighbor is not foreign to Christ, and to God the Father of our Lord and God Jesus Christ. For God is love, and everything he proclaims is always proclaimed alike, both then and now, in the Old Testament and the New.

Since Marcion has a distorted version of everything from the <First> Epistle to the Thessalonians, the fifth Epistle—so it stands in Marcion's canon but it is the eighth in the Apostle—I cite nothing from it.

Since Second Thessalonians, the sixth Epistle in Marcion but the ninth in The Apostle, has likewise been distorted by Marcion himself, again I cite nothing from it.

Of Ephesians, the seventh Epistle in Marcion, but the fifth in The Apostle, (I cite) the following:

Scholion 1 and 36. "Remember that ye, being in time past gentiles, who are called uncircumcision by that which is called the circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world. But now in Christ Jesus, ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of him. For he is our peace, who hath made of both one," and so on.

(a) Elenchus 1 and 36. "Remembering," by its nature, means the remembrance of a time. "They who are called by that which is called" means the types of the (real) things, (and Paul says) "in the flesh" to show that the type in the flesh was awaiting the time of the Spirit, in order to manifest the more perfect things instead of the type. (b) For without Christ the uncircumcised had been alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and were strangers to covenant and promise. Such people had no hope but were without God in the world, as is shown by the words of the apostle.

(c) But you can neither see nor hear, Marcion, or you would realize how many good things there were to which the holy apostle says the Law was conducive for those who had lived by the Law in those days. "For in Christ Jesus ye who were once afar off <have> now <been made> nigh through his blood. For he is our peace, who hath made of both one." (d) But if he made both one, and if he did not destroy the one but bring the other into being, then that which came first is not foreign to him and he did not separate the second from the first. He gathered them both into one, not anyhow or in appearance, but truthfully by his blood, as the apostle's sound teaching makes clear.

Scholion 2 and 37. "Wherefore he saith, Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light."

(a) Elenchus 2 and 37. Where did the apostle get "Wherefore he saith" but, plainly, from the Old Testament? This is in[213] Elijah. But what was Elijah's background? Surely, he was one of the prophets who lived by the Law, and he can be found in the Law and the Prophets. (b) Now if it was of Christ that he prophesied, "Awake thou that sleepest and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light" then the type of this had been brought to fulfillment through Lazarus and the others, though they themselves were dubious of it. Martha and Mary said, "Already he stinketh, for he hath been dead four days,"[214] and the friends of the ruler of the synagogue said, "Trouble not the master any further,"[215] and the Master himself said, "Fear not; she is not dead, but sleepeth."[216]

(c) For clearly, from then on the Gospel proclaimed that there would be resurrection through Christ, and to show Christ's capability (of this), showed the masterful ease (with which he raised the dead). For as it is easy for a man to raise, not a dead person but a sleeper, with a call, so it was the easiest thing in the world for Christ to say, "Lazarus, come forth!"[217] or "Qumi, qumi, talitha," "Get up, child!"[218] (d) Through these <plain> and manifest demonstrations the Gospel pointed to the call of ourselves, who were then asleep, from our dead works and heavy slumber; <and> to Christ, raising us and giving us light by his call. This is its second relation (to the prophecy). (e) But the final, universal (fulfillment) is expected when the same Christ who says, "I am the resurrection,"[219] calls everyone, raises them body and soul, and gives them light by his coming arrival.

Scholion 3 and 38. "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh," minus the phrase, "unto his wife."

Elenchus 3 and 38. Even if you falsify the phrase "<unto his> wife," Marcion, it has been shown many times that the contents of the Law are not foreign to the teachings of the apostle. For the whole of your tampering will be evident from the words, "They shall be one flesh."

From the Epistle to the Colossians, the eighth Epistle in Marcion but the seventh in the Apostle.

---

[213] Holl suggests emending to Isaiah, see Holl-Dummer, *Epiphanius II* p. 180.
[214] John11:39
[215] Luke 8:49
[216] Luke 8:52
[217] John 11:43
[218] Mark 5:41
[219] John 11:25

Scholion 1 and 39. "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon and sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come."

(a) Elenchus 1 and 39. A shadow, Marcion, is not cast in any way but by a body, and there cannot be a body if a shadow is not cast by it. (b) Therefore, by the remains of the truth of the sacred scriptures which you still preserve, your dupes should be convinced that the ordinances of those times were not foreign to the good things to be revealed. They were temporary provisions about food and drink, and concerning festivals, new moons and sabbaths. (c) These were the shadows of those good things. And by these shadows we have apprehended the body of the good things now present, which were foreshadowed in the Law and fulfilled in Christ.

The Epistle to Philemon, number nine,

(a) for this is its position in Marcion; but in the Apostle it stands last. In some copies, however, it is placed thirteenth before Hebrews, which is fourteenth, but other copies have the Epistle to the Hebrews tenth, before the two Epistles to Timothy, the Epistle to Titus, and the Epistle to Philemon. (b) However all sound, accurate copies have Romans first, Marcion, and do not place Galatians first as you do. In any case I cite nothing from this Epistle, Philemon, since Marcion has it in a completely distorted form.

The Epistle to the Philippians, number ten,

for this is its position in Marcion, tenth and last, but in the Apostle it stands sixth. Likewise I make no selections from it either, since in Marcion it is distorted.

This concludes Marcion's arrangement <of the> remains of the words and their subject which he preserves from Luke's Gospel and The Apostle. From it I have selected the parts of the material he retains which are against him, and have placed the refutations next to them. But in his own Apostolic Canon, as he called it, he also added, of the so-called Epistle to the Laodiceans:

Scholion 1 and 40 "(There is) one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in all."

(a) Elenchus 1 and 40. In agreement with the Epistle to the Ephesians, Marcion, you have also gathered these testimonies against yourself from the so-called Epistle to the Laodiceans. Thus, at the end of the work, we may find what you have to say by reading it and, by finding what your teachings are, see through[220] your heretical inventions, the three first principles with

[220] Epiph here plays on ἀναγνόντες, γνόντες and καταγνῶσιν.

no first principles of their own which are different from each other. (b) For the holy apostle's thesis and his authentic preaching are nothing like this, but are different from your fabrication. (c) He plainly meant, "(There is) one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God, the same Father of all, the same above all, the same through all and in all"—through the Law and the prophets, and in all the apostles and the rest.

13,1 This is my <treatise>, prefaced in the foregoing selections from the scripture which is still preserved in Marcion's own canon. Anyone who examines its collection (of texts) must be struck with awe at the dispensations of <the> bountiful God. (2) If every matter is attested and established by three witnesses, how has God granted me, by a dispensation, to put together here, as I said, a sheer total of 78 testimonies from the Gospel, and 40 from the Apostle? (3) And these are preserved in Marcion to this day and <not> disputed, so that there are 118 altogether, and all contradicting Marcion's own opinion—as though in the person of the Lord's name through eighteen, and in the name of the blessing on its right through the hundred.[221] (4) And in addition to these <he is refuted> in another, further testimony, <the one> outside of the Gospel and The Apostle. For the utter wretch Marcion did not see fit to quote this testimony from Ephesians but from Laodiceans, which is not in the Apostle. (5) Since, among his many failures, the oaf foolishly does not read these testimonies, he pathetically does not see the refutation that awaits him, although it is on record every day.

13,6 And no one need be surprised at this. Since he professed to have some of the Gospel and Apostle, how could he help preserving at least a few words of the scripture? (7) Since sacred scripture's whole body, as it were, is alive, what dead limb could he find agreeing with his opinion, in order to drag in a falsehood against the truth? (8) Instead he amputated many of the limbs, as we might say, and mutilated and falsified them, but retained some few. But the very limbs he retained are still alive and cannot be killed, but have the lifegiving property of their meaning, even if, in his canon, they have been cut off in innumerable small chunks.

14,1 But after all this I recall further that some of these same Marcionites who, blundering into an abyss of blasphemy and completely cracked from their own devilish teaching, are not ashamed to give a bad name to the heavenly generation of the Lord whom they barely saw fit to mention even by name—and that in rejecting his divinity in some other insolent

[221] ιη, or 18 = Jesus, plus ἀμήν, or 99. To make 100 texts from the Epistles, the additional text from Laodicaeans must be added to the 99.

way. (2) For some of them have dared, as I said, shamelessly to call the Lord himself the son of the evil one. Others disagree, but call him the son of the judge and demiurge. (3) <But> since he is the more compassionate and good, he has abandoned his own father below—the demiurge, say some, others say the evil one—and has taken refuge on high with the good God in realms ineffable, and come over to his side. (4) And Christ has been sent into the world by him and come in opposition to his own father, to annul all the legislation of his real father—either of the God who spoke in the Law or of the God of evil whom they rank as the third principle. (For they explain him variously, as I said, one calling him the demiurge, another the evil one.)

15,1 But to anyone with sense it is plain that these things are the thought and teaching of an unclean spirit. There should be no need to defend ourselves on this subject or supply a counter-argument against Marcion, who has become completely forgetful of his own salvation. (2) All intelligent people can detect his blasphemous nonsense and shameless work of destruction. (3) But since it is my policy not to leave room for thorns but to hew them out with God's sword—which scripture calls "<sharper> than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, of joints and marrow"[222]—I do not mind saying a few things even to this.

16,1 In the first place, if a good person is the scion of an evil one, the account of the first principles will not hold up. If Christ's father is evil—perish the thought, he is good!—but if he is evil, he is capable of having a change of heart, just as his offspring has been changed.

16,2 But otherwise. If the Only-begotten really came to save mankind, take a thief to Paradise, call a publican from a tax office to repentance, cure a whore of fornication when she anoints his feet, and do still <other> good things because he is good, kind and merciful, (3) far more should he have taken his pity on his own father and made him well first—to show his perfect goodness perfectly by converting his father first, from pity for his father. As scripture says, "to do good first unto them who are of the household of faith"[223]—how much more, have mercy on our own fathers!

16,4 But to the explanation and the rebuttal of Marcion I have added this further point. If Christ is the son of the one God and yet took refuge with the other, the other will not accept him as trustworthy. (5) If he did not keep faith with his own Father, from his previous behavior he will not be believed by the other either.

---

[222] Heb 4:12
[223] Gal 6:10

16,6 Again, moreover, from another standpoint: Are you, Marcion, <going to> accuse the good God of being unable to save those whom he intended to save, and who had received mercy from him through Christ, because he lacked an envoy? (7) For if Christ had not taken refuge with the God on high, to hear Marcion tell it, the good God would have had no one to send—if Christ's father had not come into conflict with his own son, as Marcion says.

16,8 But besides, otherwise. If Christ is the son of the demiurge, but is opposed to the creation and his father's work, as the opponent of his father's arrangement he could have destroyed mankind as soon as he came into the world, to eliminate his actual father's work. (9) Or again, once he had received the power to cure, heal and save, he should have shown the work of mercy on his own father before all, and begun by persuading his father to become like him. Thus, after he had been good to himself and his father both, one and the same goodness would become <the cause> of men's salvation.

16,10 But the truth is not as Marcion's worthless piece of fiction <has it>. There are no three first principles and no other father of Christ, nor is Christ an offspring of wickedness—perish the thought! (11) He says, "I am in the Father, and the Father in me."[224] And if he is saying falsely that he has a father, his falsely alleged father cannot be in him, or he in the father. (12) He, however, who truthfully teaches that his real Father is always good, always God and the creator of all, and that he is in him and with him, spells the threat against Marcion out with his words, "He that honoreth not the Son as he honoreth the Father, the wrath of God abideth on him."[225] (13) But by now I have shown, with many testimonies, that the God who is one , the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is good and the begetter of good, love and the begetter of love, fount of life and the begetter of a fount of life—"With thee is the well of life,"[226] says the scripture. He is truth and the begetter of truth, light and the begetter of light, life and the Person who begets life without beginning, eternally, and not in time. And Marcion's imposture has been refuted in every respect.

16,14 Since this is the case, and since by God's inspiration I have accomplished the cheat's downfall though much authentic proof, let us go once more to the rest—now that this present sect has been trodden underfoot like a great asp, by the unimpeachable word of the Savior who said,

---

[224] John 14:10
[225] Cf. John 5:23; 3:36.
[226] Ps 35:10

"I have given you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the adversary."[227] And let us set ourselves to investigate the futilities of the others and refute them completely, calling on God for aid in all things.

43.

Against Lucianists.[1] *Number twenty-three, but forty-three of the series*

1,1 Lucian is one of the ancients, not the modern one who was born during the old age of Constatine and whom the Arians, if you please, count as a martyr. This Lucian, the recent one I mean, was an adherent of the sect of the Arians. I shall speak of him later, in the refutation of them; now, however, the discussion pertains to the ancient Lucian. (2) For he was a companion of Marcion's,[2] formed a society himself by detaching it from Marcion, and founded his own sect. The Lucianists, as the ancient ones were called, derived from him.

1,3 His doctrines are like Marcion's in every way; but I have been told, and my impression of him is, <that he has only the New Testament. I do not know, however, whether he tampers with the Gospel like Marcion.> For to tell the truth, as these people were ancient and were snuffed out in short order, it has been difficult for me to track them down. The partial knowledge of his doctrines that I have is this:

1,4 After supposedly establishing that the demiurge, judge and just God is one God, but that the good God, likewise, is another and the evil God is someone else, Lucian, like Marcion, also likes to cite certain texts from the scripture of the prophets in support of his opinion. The ones I mean are, "Vain is he that serveth the Lord,"[3] and, "They withstood God and were delivered."[4]

1,5 Over and beyond the teaching[5] of his master he rejects marriage entirely and teaches celibacy not for celibacy's sake, but to refuse assent

---

[227] Luke 10:19

[1] Epiph has used Hipp. Synt. as his source, but this says no more than that Lucian was Marcion's disciple and agreed with him. Epiph reconstructs Lucian's teachings on this basis, but adds some information which he has obtained orally (1,3-5).

[2] Cf. Hipp. Refut. 7.37.2; PsT 6.3; Fil. 46; Orig. Cels. 2.27.

[3] Mal 3:14

[4] Mal 3:15

[5] Marcion taught celibacy; see p. 298 n. 14. Epiph might be referring to the reason Lucian gives for his requirements of celibacy.

to the works of the demiurge. He teaches that people should refrain from marriage in opposition to the prospering of the demiurge through procreation in the world—"From this matrimony," he says, "prosperity accrues to the demiurge through procreation in the world."[6]

1,6 But he will be detected for what he is, and refuted by the opposition which I have already offered his master, since I have given his rebuttal and refutation with many arguments: in what kinds of passages, and how many of them, the Gospel agrees with the Old Testament; (7) how our Lord himself acknowledges both that the making of the world is his very own and that the creation is his Father's—above all, to sum up, with a crowning argument found in St. John, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made,"[7] and the rest.

2,1 But he himself can certainly be refuted at once. For though he may like to say that the bond of matrimony is refused for the sake of opposing the things the demiurge has made and refusing assent to them so as not to cooperate with the demiurge—thus keeping entirely away from the work of the demiurge—how can his opinion be anything but irrational, easy to detect, and refutable at once? (2) For observe, the tramp and charlatan solicits the loan both of food and clothing, both drinkables and edibles, from creation and the handiwork of the demiurge, and there is no way he can avoid these things and make no use of them.

2,3 For God the Lord and Demiurge, in caring for all, makes his sun rise on evil and good, sends his rain on those who blaspheme and those who glorify him, and nourishes all. (4) (This is) not by some senseless, unfeeling decree but, because of the vengeance he has ordained at the coming judgment, he is patient and, in keeping with his aid to all, orders all things by his own decrees and wisdom, so that the repentant may receive his pardon and obtain salvation. (5) But if they should persist in their blasphemous opinions and the vain beliefs which God never gave them, then, after their departure when they have no more free agency, <he will punish them justly>—not, however, passing the sentence that will be theirs from wrath or inflicting their coming punishments as in anger; (6) he has given forewarning of all this because of his Godhead which is not subject to passions. (It will be) because of the <wickedness> with which each of the unrighteous, by doing something to his own harm, has become accessory

[6] See the polemic against matrimony at Test. Tr. 29,26-30.
[7] John 1:1;3

to his own <condemnation>. God is not to blame for our defection and our condemnation because of it.

2,7 And so this man too can be detected as in every way part and parcel of the sects before and after him, and one of the sons of perdition—as the truth shows us, and the light of the Gospel which brightly illumines the whole world, and truly saves the sons of the true faith. (8) Therefore, as though we had killed a snake quickly with a short cudgel <when it peeped> from its hole[8] and had left it dead, let us go on to the rest as promised, availing ourselves of God's help for the establishment of his truth.

44.

Against Apelleans.[1] *Number 24, but forty-four of the series*

1,1 The successor of this Lucian is Apelles—not the saint who is commended by the holy apostle[2] but another person, the founder of the Apelleans. He too was the fellow-student of Lucian himself, and Marcion's disciple[3]—like a thick growth of offshoots from a single root of many thorns!

1,2 Apelles likes to teach his doctrines differently than from the others and, arming himself against his own teacher and against the truth, propounds doctrines like the following for the sake of gathering his own school of misguided people. (3) This is not the way it was, he claims, but Marcion is wrong—to make it evident that stupidity refutes itself in every way, and that wickedness is crushed to bits within itself by raising up its refutation against itself—while the truth is always steadfast and in need of no assistance, but self-authenticating and always commended in the sight of the God who is <truly> God.

1,4 Now this Apelles and his school claim that there are neither three first principles, nor two, as Lucian and Marcion thought, but, he says,

---

[8] Holl ἐκ τῆς ὀπῆς; Text σκόπου.

[1] With this Sect cf. Hipp. Refut. 7.38; 10.20; PsT 6.4-6; Fil. 47; Eus. H. E. 5.13.1-8; Tert. De Anima 23.3; 36.3; Carn. Chr. 1.6-8; Adv. Marc. 3.11; 4.17; Praescr. 30; 33; 34; Res. Carn. 2.5. There are noticeable resemblances to Hipp. Refut. 7.38.2-3 and PsT 6.5, see nn. 8 and 13. However the source of this Sect, which omits striking details found in Epiph's usual sources, is not obvious.

[2] Rom 16:10

[3] Hipp. Refut. 7.38.1; 10.20.1; PsT 6.4; Fil. 47; Tert. Adv. Marc. 3.11; 4.17

there is one good God,[4] one first principle, and one power that cannot be named. Nothing here in this world is of any concern to this one God—or first principle, if you prefer. (5) However, this same holy and good God on high made one other God.[5] And the God who was created as another God created all things—heaven, earth, and everything in the world. (6) But he proved not to be good, and his creatures not to be well made. Because of his inferior intelligence, his <creatures> have been badly created.[6]

1,7 Who can put up with assertions like these and not laugh instead at this sort of wasted effort? It will be made evident in two ways that, in holding such an opinion, he is in the wrong. (8) And so I shall address him as though he were here: "Tell me, Mister! You will either admit, Apelles, that God had no knowledge of the future when he created a God who, you claim, has made his creations badly—or else he foreknew that the God he was creating would turn out like that, and he made him for this reason, so as not to be responsible for his bad creations. (9) From every standpoint the God on high must himself be the demiurge, since he made the one God who has made everything. The God who has made the creatures cannot be responsible for them; this must be the God on high, who made the creator even though he himself is the demiurge of all things.

2,1 But he says that Christ, the son of the good God on high, has come in the last time, as has his Holy Spirit, for the salvation of those who come to the knowledge of him. (2) And at his coming he has not appeared (merely) in semblance, but has really taken flesh. Not from Mary the Virgin, but he has real flesh and a body—<though> neither from a man's seed nor from a virgin woman. (3) He did get real flesh, <but> in the following way. On his way from heaven[7] he came to earth, says Apelles, and assembled his own body from the four elements.[8]

---

[4] PsT 6.4: Hic introducit unum deum <in> infinitis superioribus partibus; Fil. 47.2: ego unum principium praedico quem Deum conosco; and cf. Eus. H. E. 5.13.1-2; 5-7. In contrast

[5] PsT 6.4: Hic introducit unum Deum. Hunc . . . fecisse . . . et alium Virtutem quam dominum dicit sed angelum ponit; Fil. 47.2: Deus . . . fecit etiam alteram Virtutem quem Deum scio esse sescundum. Hipp. Refut. 7.38.1-2; 20.1 makes Apelles predicate four Gods, though he calls all but the first "angels."

[6] Fil. 47.3: Hic autem deus qui fecit mundum non est, inquit, bonus. This might have come from Epiph; contrast PsT 6.4: . . . cui mundo permiscuisse paenitentiam quia non illum tam perfecte fuissset quam ille superior mundus institutus fuisset.

[7] PsT 6.5: Christum . . . in eo, quo de superioribus partibus descenderit, ipso descensu sideream sibi carnem et aëream contexuisse.

[8] 2,1-3 Cf. Hipp. Refut. 7.38.3; 10.2. For Christ's assumption of flesh from the elements see also Tert. Adv. Marc. 3.11. At NHC's Gr. Seth 51, 4-7 Sophia builds "houses" from

2,4 And why is this man too not pressed, so that his wickedness may be detected in its following of the ancient Greek poets' beliefs about this nonsense? For he too claims, like them and even more foolishly, that the Savior gave substance to his own body. (5) <He took> the dry part of it from the dry element, the warm part from the warm element, the wet part from the wet and the cool from the cool,[9] and so fashioning his own body he has appeared in the world in reality and taught us the knowledge on high, (6) and to despise the demiurge and disown his works. And he showed us which sayings are actually his and in which scripture, and which come from the demiurge.[10] "Thus," Apelles tells us, "he said in the Gospel, Be ye able money-changers.[11] For from all of scripture I select what is helpful and make use of it."

2,7 Then, says Apelles, Christ allowed himself to suffer in that very body, was truly crucified and truly buried and truly arose, and showed that very flesh to his own disciples.[12] (8) And he dissolved that very humanity of his, reapportioned its own property to each element and gave it back, warm to warm, cool to cool, dry to dry, wet to wet. And so, after again separating the body of flesh from himself, he soared away to the heaven[13] from which he had come.[14]

3,1 What a lot of theater on the part of people who say such things—a clown act, as anyone can see, rather than a promise of life or the character of wisdom! (2) If Christ really destroyed the very body he had taken, why would he prepare it for himself in the first place? (3) But if he prepared it for some use but had finished using it, he should have left it in the ground—especially as, in your view, the sight of our hope, the resurrection of the flesh, need not be brought to pass. (4) But to give himself more

---

the "elements below," though not for himself but for the "fellow workers" of the "sons of light."

[9] Hipp. Refut. 7.38.3: ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς οὐσίας μερῶν σῶμα πεποιηκέναι τουτέστι θερμοῦ καὶ ψυχροῦ, καὶ ὑγροῦ και ξηροῦ.

[10] Cf. Eus. H. E. 5.13.2. At Orig. Cels. 5.54 Apelles is said to disparage the miracle narratives in the Jewish scriptures. See also Orig. in Gen. Hom. 2.2 (Baehrens 27,17-30,3).

[11] A version of this saying appears at PS 3.134 (MacDermot, p. 348).

[12] Hipp. Refut. 7.38.4: Αὐθις δὲ ὑπὸ Ιουδαίων ἀνασκοπολισθέντα θανεῖν, καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἐγερθέντα φανῆναι τοῖς μαθηταῖς…

[13] Hipp. Refut. 7.38.5: σάρκα…δείξας ἀπέδωκε γῇ…ἑκάστοις τὰ ἴδια ἀπέδωκε, λύσας πάλιν τὸν δεσμὸν τοῦ σώματος τουτέστιν θερμῷ τὸ θερμόν, ψυχρῷ τὸ ψυχρόν, ὑγρῷ τὸ ὑγρόν, ξηρῷ τὸ ξηρόν, καὶ οὕτως ἐπορεύθην πρὸς τὸν ἀγαθὸν πατέρα; PsT 7.5: Hunc in resurrectionem singulis quibusdam elementis quae in descensu suo mutuatus fuisset is ascensu reddidisse, et sic dispersus quibusque partibus corporis sui partibus in caelum spiritum tantum reddidisse, and the similar Fil. 47.6.

[14] Cf. Apocry. Jas. 2.23-25.

trouble for nothing he raised it again—preparing it and yet laying it in a tomb, dissolving it and, like a conscientious debtor, distributing to each element the part he had taken from it.

3,5 And if he was really giving <its own> back to each element—that is, giving the cool part to the cool, the warm part to the warm—these things could not have been seen by his disciples.[15] But this is not true of the body, which is dry! (6) For "the dry" is surely a body, flesh and bones, and "the wet" is surely the humors, and flesh dissolving into wetness. He surely indicated these things very plainly to the apostles when he was discarding them—(7) as, first of all, when his body was being buried Joseph of Arimathaea was privileged to wrap it in a shroud and lay it in a tomb. (8) And the women too, at the same time, could see where the remains had been left, so that they could honor them with perfumes and fragrant oils, as (he had been honored) at the first. (9) But this falsehood of yours is not revealed anywhere, you Apelleans, by any of the holy apostles, for it is not so. They were able to see the two invisible men, and saw himself ascending to heaven and received by a shining cloud, but they did not see his remains left anywhere—there was no need for that, and it was not possible. And Apelles, and his school of Apelleans, are lying.

4,1 About the other flesh and the rest he taught things similar to his master Marcion, claiming that there is no resurrection of the dead, and he saw fit likewise to hold all the other doctrines that <Marcion used to teach in disparagement of> earthly <creatures>.[16]

4,2 But his reasoning will be demolished as a silly thing and wrong in every way. For darkness will not prevail where the light is glimpsed, nor will falsehood remain once the truth is <visible>. (3) If you use the scriptures at all, Apelles and your Apellean namesakes, you will find yourselves refuted from these very scriptures.

4,4 In the first place, God made man in the image of God ; and the Maker of man said, "Let *us* make man in our image and after our likeness."[17]—as though one were to return from your erring sect to the truth as though escaping darkness and arising from night, and find the light of the knowledge of God dawning on him like the sun and brighter. (5) For to anyone in his right mind it will be evident that the Person who said, "Let us make man," is God the Father of all. But to join him he is inviting

---

[15] I.e., these things are invisible. The dry and the wet parts, Epiph will go on to say, were visible and seen by the disciples when Jesus was buried, thus disproving Apelles' thesis.

[16] Cf. Hipp. Refut. 10.20.2; PsT 6.6; Tert. De Anima 32.3; Carn. Chr. 8.

[17] Gen 1:26

the divine Word, the only-begotten Son who is ever with him, begotten of him without beginning and not in time—and at one and the same time his Holy Spirit, who is not foreign to him or to his own Son. (6) For if the God who fashioned man—that is, who also created the world—were different from the good God on high from whom Christ descended, Christ would not have taken a body for himself and fashioned it, thus patterning himself after the demiurge.[18] (7) But it is plain that he himself, to whom the Father said, "Let us make man in our image and after our likeness," is the demiurge of man and the world. (8) And from the one work he will be plainly proved to be the workman, since this is he who fashioned man's body from earth then, and made it a living soul.

4,9 Thus St. John testified in the holy Gospel, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made in him, and were made by him, and apart from him was not anything made,"[19] and the rest. (10) But if all things <were made> in him, and made by him, he himself formed Adam then. And in turn, he himself formed the body once more, from the Virgin Mary, patterned after himself, and perfectly united his entire humanity, which was formed by him then and which was now united with himself.[20]

4,11 But suppose he took another person's work, one belonging to the God who had fashioned the first man badly and who, according to your teaching, is bad. And suppose that he made any use of the bad products which the bad maker, as you say, had produced. Then, by his use of them, by his doing them good, and by his own image, he was involved in the badness of their maker. But this is unacceptable. (12) For if he became incarnate, he has taken not only flesh but a soul as well. This must be plain. Otherwise, why did he say, "I have power to take my soul and power to lay it down"?[21] (13) Thus, in assuming the whole business, the thing the Demiurge called his "image," the Word assumed humanity in its entirety and came with body and soul, and everything that makes a man. (14) Now since these things were accomplished in this way, your poison has altogether lost its strength and your edifice without foundation has toppled, lacking the firmness of the support of the truth.

---

[18] I.e., like any human body, Christ's was made in the image of God.
[19] John 1:1-3
[20] That is, united it with his Godhead after his ascension. See De Inc. 2,8-3,1, p. 57.
[21] John 10:18

5,1 But if, besides, you take what you choose from sacred scripture and leave what you choose, you have set up as a judge—not as an interpreter of the laws, but as a culler out of things which were not written to suit you—things that are true, but but which in your teaching have been falsely altered to suit your deceit and the deceit of your dupes.

5,2 But if a bad maker really produced the things here, I mean the world, why did the emissary of the good Father come to such a world? And if it was to save human beings, then he was in charge of his own, and their demiurge can have been no one else. (3) And if he was not providing for his own, but wants to encroach on the domain of others and save what does not belong to him, then he is a parasite hovering around someone else's possessions. Or he is an egotist, out to get things that are not his, in order to appear better than their creator in the other person's possessions which he is trying to save. And thus he cannot be trustworthy. (4) Or, you tramp, from what you say he is a person of no consequence and, lacking his own creation, he covets the possessions of others and tries to hijack them by helping himself, from someone else's stock, to souls which do not belong to him and his Father.

5,5 If the souls are his, however, and it is evident that they have come from above, then they were sent from your good God on high into a good world, not into something which was poorly made. (6) But if they were sent to serve some purpose, of which you probably give a mythological account, and were diverted to another one on their arrival—if, in other words, they were sent to do something right but accomplished something wrong—it will be evident that the God who sent them had no foreknowledge. For he sent them for one purpose, and it turned out that they did something else. (7) Or again, if you say that they have not come by his will, but by the tyranny of the God who seizes them, then the inferior demiurge, the creation of the good God, is more powerful than the good God—since he snatched the good God's propertiy from him and put it to his own use.

5,8 How can you escape refutation when the Savior himself says, "I have power to lay my soul down and to take it"[22]—meaning that he himself has taken a soul, laid it down and taken it again, so that the soul is not foreign to him and the work of another creator? (9) And again, he will plainly have a good body. No one good can be induced to make use of evil work. Otherwise he will be contaminated himself from partaking of the evil, by the ill effect of the intermixture.

[22] John 10:18

5,10 And tell me, what was the point of his abandoning his body again after its resurrection, even though he had raised it, and of apportioning to the four elements, warm to warm, cool to cool, dry to dry, wet to wet? (11) If he raised it in order to destroy it again, this must surely be stage business, not reality. But our Lord Jesus Christ raised the very thing which he had fashioned in his own image and took it with him, body with soul and all the manhood in its entirety. (12) For God gave him his seat as, in the words of the apostle, "God raised him and made him sit with him in heavenly places"[23]—as the two testify who appeared to the apostles in shining garments, "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, will some come *in like manner* as ye have seen him being taken up."[24]

6,2 And long after our Savior's ascension—to deprive you of another excuse for mischief against the truth—when God's holy martyr Stephen was being stoned by the Jews he answered and said, "Behold, I see heaven opened, and the Son of Man standing at the right hand of the Father."[25] This was to display the body itself, truly risen to the spiritual realm with the Godhead of the Only-begotten, wholly united with the spiritual and one with Godhead. (3) The sacred body itself is on high with the Godhead—altogether God, one Son, the Holy One of God seated at the Father's right hand. As the Gospels of Mark and the other evangelists put it, "And he ascended up to heaven and sat on the right hand of the Father."[26] And your and your dupes' trashy yarn will be a complete failure from every standpoint.

6,4 And of the resurrection of the dead, hear the apostle saying, "this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality."[27] (5) For unless the mortal (body) were to put on immortality and the corruptible (body) incorruption, the Immortal would not have come to die, so as to suffer, sleep the three days and rise in the mortal body, and thus take it up in himself, united with his Godhead and glory, allowing us, because of his good sojourn among us, truly to obtain all that we had hoped for—showing himself a pattern and a pledge for us, for the hope of the full realization of life.

7,1 Since these things are so and have been said,[28] why should I waste more time, for refutation or anything else, on this wasp which, although

---

[23] Eph 2:6
[24] Acts 1:11
[25] Acts 7:56
[26] Mark 16:19
[27] 1 Cor 15:33
[28] An unusual locution. Lipsius suggests that Epiph means "said in my source."

it is inconsiderable, has a sting that smarts? It has destroyed its own sting, and the counterfeit doctrine of its error has been proved untenable and trashy.

7,2 For they say that the wasp with the painful sting which some have called the "smarting wasp" has a short poisoned sting that cannot cause great pain, but is as poisonous as it is possible for it to be. (3) And whenever someone goes through (the weeds) and destroys its den or house—it makes hives and something like a honeycomb in bushy weeds, and in these hives deposits its seed and begets its offspring. But if someone going through breaks into the honeycomb with a staff or club and knocks it down, as I said, the formidable but feeble wasp itself comes out in a rage. (4) And if it finds a rock nearby, or a tree, from the rage that has filled it it sets on it buzzing, darts at it and stings it. And yet it can do no harm to the rock or the tree, and certainly not to the man even if it bites him, except to the extent of a little pain. (5) And least of all can it hurt the rock; it breaks its sting and dies, but the rock cannot be harmed by the likes of it. (6) Thus, like the smarting wasp, this wasp-like creature which can cause a little pain will be demolished by colliding with the rock, that is, wilth the truth, and breaking its sting.

7,7 But now that I have finished with this sect I am going to the others in turn, trusting, as my hope is in God, that by God's inspiration my task will be accomplished.

45.

Against Severians.[1] *Number twenty-five, but forty-five of the series*

1,1 After these there follows <Severus>, who was either their contemporary or <born> about <their> time. I cannot speak of his time for certain, but they were quite close to each other. At all events, I shall give what information I have.

1,2 One Severus the founder of the so-called Severians arose, following next after Apelles. His fairy stories are the ones I am now about to relate. (3) He too attributes the creation around us to principalities and authorities and holds that, in some unnameable and very high heaven and world, there is a good God. (4) But he claims that the devil is the son of the chief

[1] Eusebius at H. E. 4.29.4-5 makes Severus a follower of Tatian, who teaches about "invisible aeons" and who further uses the Law and the Prophets while rejecting Paul. There is no obvious connection between this and the account Epiph gives here.

archon[2] in the authorities' retinue, whom he sometimes terms Ialdabaoth[3] and sometimes Sabaoth.[4] This son whom he has begotten is a serpent. (5) But he was cast to earth by the power on high, and after descending in the form of a serpent he became aroused and lay with the earth as with a woman and, since he ejaculated the seed of its generation, the vine was sired by him.[5]

1,6 And when he is telling stories for proof of their nonsens, <he wants> the snakelike roundness of the vine to be a representation[6] (of it), and says that the vine's twisty shape itself is like a snake. (7) And the grapes of the vine, also, are like drops or flecks of poison because the rounded form of each grape is either globular, or (first) tapering and (then) fat. (8) And for this reason it is wine that confuses people's minds and sometimes makes them amorous[7] and sometimes rouses them to frenzy or, again, renders them angry, since the body becomes dim-witted from the power of the wine and the poison of this dragon. Persons of this persuasion accordingly abstain from wine altogether.

2,1 They also claim, as the Archontics have, that woman is the work of Satan. Hence they say that those who have conjugal intercourse are doing Satan's work. (2) And moreover, half of man is God's but half is the devil's. (2) He says that from the navel up man is the work of the power of God, but from the navel down he is the work of the evil authority. And this, he says, is why anything involving pleasure, frenzy and lust happens below the navel. But other sects too have made this claim.[8]

3,1 And so Severus too is exposed, in every way, as the follower of the other tramps who have prepared these poisons for the world. For he will be refuted easily; the rebuttal in his case will require no very great effort. (2) For the body as a whole is pervaded by the things which God has rightly placed in it. I mean desires, which God has placed there, not for a anything irregular but for good use and the orderliness of essential need. (I am speaking the desire for sleep, food, drink, clothing, and all the others which arise in us at our own pleasure and God's). (3) Thus I can prove too that even sexual desire itself is nothing wrong. (4) It has been

---

[2] Apocry. Jn. II,1 10,19-21: "the first archon."
[3] See p. 85 n. 9.
[4] See p. 85 n. 10.
[5] Cf. Orig. Wld. 109,26-29; Plutarch De Iside et Osiride 6,353B.
[6] ἐκτυποῦν. Cf. Pan. 65,6,8.
[7] Cf. Orig. Wld. 109,26-29.
[8] See the polemics against sexual intercourse found *passim* in Thom. Cont., and at Test. Tr. 29,22-30,17; 65,1-8.

given for seemly procreation, as seeds have been given to the earth for an abundant yield of the good produce God has created, I mean <pasturage> and fruit trees. Thus sexual desire was given to the human race to fulfill the commandment, "Increase and multiply and fill the earth."[9]

4,1 Severians use certain apocrypha as I have heard, but also the canonical books in part, hunting out only those texts which they can reinterpret by combining them to suit themselves.[10] (2) For that the vine was neither engendered by the devil nor sired by a snake is plain to everyone. How could this be, when the Lord himself gives his testimony and says, "I shall not drink of the fruit of the vine until I drink it new with you in the kingdom of heaven."[11] (3) And since, shining its rays in accordance with God's foreknowledge from first to last, the truth has framed its words beforehand against the evils that threaten us, the sacred scripture foretold the rout of those who would rise up against the truth. (4) For example, in refutation of the pathetic, deluded Severus, the Lord himself somewhere expressly calls himself the vine and says, "I am the true vine."[12] If the vine's name were at all blameworthy, he would not make a comparison of the name with himself.

4,5 Moreover the apostles as well, in the work called the Constitution, say, "The catholic church is God's plantation and vineyard."[13] Again, moreover, in giving the parable of the vineyard in the Gospel, the Lord himself says, "A certain man that was an householder, having a vineyard, let it out to husbandmen and sent seeking fruit, and they would not give it."[14] And again, moreover, "A man that was an householder, having a vineyard, went out seeking laborers for his vineyard, both about the third hour, and the sixth, and the ninth, and the eleventh."[15] In conclusion, then, the fraud too which has been fabricated by this cheat has been damaged beyond repair by a word of the truth. For even if the darkness appears when the light is not there, its disappearance will be caused by a tiny spark of refutation.

4,9 But I have dealt summarily with this sect since, as I have already stated, its cure is easy, and not much effort is required to establish the truth against it. But above all, I am pretty sure that it has no more adherents except a very few in the far north. (10) Now that I have crushed it all at

---

[9] Gen 1:28
[10] Eus. H. E. 4.29.5
[11] Matt 26:29
[12] John 15:1
[13] Didascalia 1.1
[14] Matt 21:33-35
[15] Matt 20:1-6

once like a horrid scorpion, let me move on from this sect and investigate the rest—calling God's power to my aid that I may speak the truth and escape harm myself, particularly as I shall be touching on a such dreadful, baneful doctrinal malice.

46.

Against Tatianists.[1] *Number twenty-six, but fotry-six of the series*

1,1 One Tatian, who lived either at the same time as they or after them, arose as their successor and presented the teaching of his own nonsense. (2) And at first, due to his Greek background and education,[2] he flourished[3] together with Justin[4] the philosopher, a holy man and dear to God who had been converted from Samaritanism to faith in Christ. (3) This Justin was Samaritan, <but> after coming to believe in Christ, practicing a rigorous asceticism and exhibiting a life of virtue, he finally suffered martyrdom for Christ and was granted the perfect crown at Rome, during the prefecture of Rusticus[5] and the reign of Hadrian.

1,4 Since Tatian flourished with Justin he bore himself well at first and was sound in the faith, as long as he was with St. Justin Martyr. (5) But when St. Justin died[6] it was as though a blind man <who> needed a guide had been deserted by his escort and, once deserted, had got out onto a precipice because of his blindness and fell off with nothing to stop him, until he plunged to his death. It was like this with Tatian.

1,6 The information which has come my way says that he was Syrian.[7] However he first founded his school in Mesopotamia about the twelfth year of Antoninus, the Caesar who was surnamed Pius.[8] (7) For after the

---

[1] The primary source of this Sect may well be Hipp. Synt., which is represented by PsT 7.1 and Fil. 48; see Pourkier pp. 343-361. However, Epiph has filled out this meager report from other sources. Iren. 1.28.1 gives much the same information as Epiph; he is followed by Hipp. Refut. 8.16.1 and Eus. H. E. 4.29.3. Epiph appears to have used Eusebius' Chronicle, Clement's Stromata, and perhaps the Martyrdom of Justin and Origen's Serial Comments on Matthew. See nn. 4,6.

[2] Cf. Tatian Oratio 42.

[3] Pourkier: il fu à son sommet

[4] Iren. 1.28.1

[5] Martyrdom of Justin, sec. 1

[6] PsT 7.1; Fil. 48; Iren. 1.2;8.1; Eus. H. E. 4.29.3

[7] Clem. Strom. 3.12.81.1

[8] The source of this information is Eus. p. 206,13. Chron. Epiph has confused Antoninus Pius with Marcus Aurelius, whom Eusebius elsewhere calls Marcus Antoninus qui et Verus. See Pourkier p. 350 n. 33.

perfecting of St. Justin he moved from Rome to the east and lived there and, falling into an evil way of thinking, he too introduced certain aeons in the style of Valentinus' mythology,[9] and certain principles and emanations. (8) He established his teaching mostly between Antioch by Daphne and Cilicia but even more in Pisidia, for the so-called Encratites[10] have gotten their share of his poison from him, in succession. (9) It is said that the Diatessaron,[11] which some call "According to the Hebrews," was written by him.

2,1 He too teaches the same doctrines as the ancient sects. And in the first place, he claims that Adam cannot be saved.[12] And he preaches continence, regards matrimony as fornication and seduction, and claims that marriage is no different from fornication but the same thing.[13] Thus he adopted his deceitful style of life in the guise of continence and continent behavior, like a ravening wolf putting a sheep's fleece on and deceiving his dupes with the temporary disguise. (10) He celebrates mysteries too in imitation of the holy church, but uses only water in these mysteries.[14]

2,4 He too will collapse in every way with his inconsistent teaching. I believe that both he and his school have been snuffed out already and come to an end. For where are there not arguments to refute someone like this? (5) First, <it must be said to him too>—as I have explained already, and <said to> the sects which make such claims—that there cannot be many first principles which are generative of a succession of generated principles. (6) The many principles will turn out to be one, <as> the effects of the one real cause of them all. And there cannot be many first principles other than the one which has been the cause of these, and all things must be traced to the one sole monarchy. And this man's attempt to persuade has fallen flat, since it is falsehood, not truth, and can have no persuasiveness. For the whole of his teaching is foolish.

2,7 And if Adam, the lump, cannot be saved, neither can any <product of> the lump be saved. For if the one who was formed first and made

---

[9] PsT 7.1; Fil. 48; Iren. 1.28.1; Hipp. Refut. 8.16.1; Eus H. E. 4.29.3

[10] Iren. 1.28.1 and Eus. H. E. 4.29.1; Chron. 206,13 make Tatian the founder of the Encratites. See Pan. 47.1.7.

[11] Eusebius attributes the Diatessaron to Tatian at H. E. 4.29.6.

[12] PsT 7.1; Iren. 1.28.1; 3.23.8; Hipp. Refut. 8.16.1; Eus. H. E. 4.29.3

[13] Iren. 1.28.1; Hip. Refut. 8.16.1; Eus. H. E. 4.29.6; Jer. Adv. Jov. 1.3; 2.16; Clem. Strom. 3.12.81.1-3

[14] Epiph assumes that this was Tatian's practice because Encratites were reputed to follow it. For Gnostic or encratite parallels see Acts of Peter 1.2 (H-S 2 p. 188); Acts of Thomas 121 (H-S II p. 288); Acts of Paul 7 (H-S II p. 253). For the practice in catholic circles see Cyprian of Carthage Ep. 63.11.1; 14.1.

from virgin soil will have no part in salvation, how will things begotten of him obtain salvation?

3,1 For Tatian will prove to be contradicting himself in two ways. He claims that matrimony is not from God, but is fornication and uncleanness—and yet he thinks that he, the child of matrimony, born of a woman and the seed of a man, can be saved! (2) In turn, then, he has demolished his own blasphemy against matrimony. If he, the result of a marriage, will obtain salvation, then marriage is not fornication whatever he may choose to say, since it produces the ones who have a part in salvation.

3,3 But if his assertion that marriage is unlawful can be proved, then all the more will Adam be saved. Adam was no product of marriage; he was fashioned by the hand of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, as was said to the Son by the holy Father himself, "Let us make man in our image and after our likeness."[15] (4) And why can Adam, of whom you despair, not be saved when, on coming into the world, our Lord Jesus Christ himself raised the dead in their actual bodies after their deaths—like Lazarus, and the widow's son, and the daughter of the ruler of the synagogue? (5) And if it was not he himself who fashioned Adam from earth at the beginning, why did he spit on the ground, make clay, anoint the eyes of the man born blind, and make him see—(6) to show that he himself, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, was his fashioner and by applying the clay was adding the missing part to the defective place in the man born blind? He has plainly done this to repair the defective part.

3,7 But again, Tatian, if it is the Lord who both fashioned Adam and then destroys the man he fashioned first but saves the others, how stupid of you! (8) To the best of your ability you are attributing inability to the Lord , if he was unable to save his first-fashioned—who had been expelled from Paradise for one transgression, had been subjected to no light discipline, had spent his life in sweat and toil and lived opposite Paradise to remind him of his good life there—if he was unable to save him through his repentance <at the end>.

3,9 <Or else you are attributing cruelty to the Lord>, if he was able to save Adam but showed no mercy. Why did Christ descend even to the underworld? Why did he take his three day sleep before he arose? Where is the application of "that he might be Lord both of the dead and of the living?"[16] Lord of which "living and dead," if not of those who stand in

[15] Gen 1:26
[16] Rom 14:9

need of his aid on earth and under it? (10) And how can that which comes from the lump not be holy if the lump itself is not holy, as we find in the holy apostle? For this same holy apostle says of Eve too, "She shall be saved through childbearing, if they continue in faith and righteousness."[17]

4,1 And much can be said about this—just as, to everyone with sense, the obvious blasphemy and clouded thinking of Tatian and his Tatianist namesakes will be plain. (2) As for them, I have gone briefly over the kind of bites they inflict—harmful ones, like mosquito bites—and have healed them with the Lord's truth and power, applying a salve of the Lord's teaching to people who have been bitten by Tatian's assertions. For the Lord himself says, "I am not come but for the lost sheep of the house of Israel."[18] (3) And thus he said in parables that a man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, the man he also said fell among thieves, to show that the sheep is also the person who went down from Jerusalem—the one who fell from the greater glory to diminution, and the one who was drawn away from the one commandment of his true shepherd, and went astray. (4) We thus believe that the holy Adam, <our> father, is among the living. For his sake and the sake of us all, his descendants, Christ came to grant amnesty to whose who had always known him and not strayed from his divinity, but were detained in Hades for their lapses—an amnesty through repentance for those who were still in the world, one through mercy and deliverance to those who were in Hades.

5,1 And so we must be surprised at someone (like Tatian) who knows—as I too have found in the literature—that our Lord Jesus Christ was crucified on Golgotha, nowhere else than where Adam's body lay buried.[19] (2) For after leaving Paradise, living opposite it for a long time and growing old, Adam later came and died in this place, I mean Jerusalem, and was buried there, on the site of Golgotha. (3) This is probably the way the place, which means "Place of a Skull," got its name, since the contour of the site bears no resemblance to a skull. (4) Neither is it on some peak so that this can be interpreted as a skull, as we say of <the> head's position on a body. Nor is it on a height. (5) And indeed, it is no higher than the other "places" either. Opposite it is the Mount of Olives, which is higher; and Gibeon, eight milestones off, is the highest (of the three). Even the

---

[17] 1 Tim 2:15

[18] Matt 15:24

[19] The earliest mention of this tradition, and the probable source of Epiph,'s information, is Orig. Com. Ser. in Matt 126 on Matt 27:33 (Klostermann, p. 265). Cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 46.3.2.

height which was once in Zion but has now been leveled was itself taller than Golgotha.

5,6 Why the name "Of the Skull" then, unless because the skull of the first-formed man had there and his remains were laid to rest there, and so it had been named "Of the Skull"? (7) By being crucified above them our Lord Jesus Christ mystically showed our salvation, through the water and blood that flowed from him through his pierced side—at the beginning of the lump beginning to sprinkle our forefather's remains, (8) to show us too the sprinkling of his blood for the cleansing of our defilement and that of any repentant soul; and to show, as an example of the leavening and cleansing of the filth our sins have left, the water which was poured out on the one who lay buried beneath him, for his hope and the hope of us his descendants.

5,9 Thus the prophecy, "Awake thou that sleepest and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light,"[20] was fulfilled here. For even though it is speaking of us, who are dead in our works and asleep with a deep sleep of ignorance, this <was> the start of the mystery. <For indeed>, it includes the manner <of the resurrection>. (10) And not without reason or idly; it says, "Many bodies of the saints arose"—as the Gospel puts it—"and went with him into the holy city."[21] And it did not say "souls of the saints" arose; the actual bodies of the saints arose and went into the holy city with him, and so on.

5,11 And now that we have brushed this mosquito's bites off by every means with the oil of God's lovingkindness, our Lord's incarnation, and the light of the Gospel of truth, let us again press on to the rest as usual, by the power of God.

---

[20] Eph 5:14
[21] Matt 27:52-53

CORRECTED PASSAGES

34,16,3 Holl στοιχείοις: Klostermann στίχοις
36,1,3 Holl Γύγης: Weymann Γύης
37,5,3 Holl ὄφις: Klostermann οὗτος
38,6,4 Holl εἶπεν: Klostermann <προ>εῖπεν
39,2,5 Holl τῆς τοι<αύ>της: Klostermann ταύτης τῆς
42,11,7 Holl <παρ'>ἡμῶν: Klostermann ἡμῖν
42,11,15 elenchus 12b Holl Προποδιάδος: or, Welcker προπεδιάδος: or, Dummer Προποιτίδος
42,11,15 elenchus 40b Holl δέ: Klostermann γε
42,11,15 elenchus 77a Holl πόθεν: Riedinger πῶς
Holl ἀπὸ φαντασίας: Riedinger κατὰ φαντασίαν
Riedinger <διὸ καὶ τὸν ἄρτον ἔκλασεν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ>
42,12,3 elenchus 3 and 27 Klostermann <διὸ ἐλάλησα>
43,2,2 Holl ἄλλως: Klostermann ἁπλῶς
46,2,6 Holl αἱ γὰρ οὖσαι πολλαὶ καὶ μία, <ἅτε> ἐκ τῆς μίας ὑπαρχοῦσαι οὐσης αἰτίας τῶν πάσων, εὑρεθήσονται: Klostermann αἱ γὰρ οὖσαι πολλαὶ κατὰ μίαν ἐκ τῆς μιᾶς ὑπαρχούσαι (ἐκ τῆς οὔσης πρώτης αἰτίας τῶν πάσων) εὑρεθήσονται

INDEX OF REFERENCES

Nag Hammadi Codices

Allogenes
51,12-17 85
53,21-28 85
53,22-28 63
53,27-28 63
59,1-9 85
68,25-28 279

Apocalypse of Adam
64,14-19 264
65,3-9 276
66,1-6 276
69,1-75,14 91
71,8-72,14 269, 276
73,13-29 278
74,7-30 98
74,26-76,7 269
75,1-3 269
75,17-27 81
76,8-77,18 277
76,28-77,3 117
77,9-18 78, 117
77,16-18 117
78,9-11 81
85,19-22 276
85,19-31 250

Apocalypse of James, First
27,1-5 172
28,15-20 191
30,2-6 70
31,14-22 70, 78
31,17-22 117
33,2-36,1 102
33,13-34,18 257
34,3 184
35,5-13 184
35,13-17 85
35,21-23 258
36,5 184
36,13-16 80

Apocalypse of James, Second
56,23-57,1 85
57,10-19 70, 290

Apocryphon of James
1,5 170
1,23-24 257
2,23-25 368
2,29-35 99
3,34-4,22 168
3,34-37 99
4,32-5,3 110
5,9-6,20 79
5,13 110
6,9-21 110
8,8-9 178
8,35-36 102
10,34-38 110
11,39-12,5 190
12,20-22 258
14,19-21 257
15,25-26 170

Apocryphon of John (BG 8502,2)
47,14-49,9 253
51,4 86

Apocryphon of John (II,1)
4,8 170
4,19-26 178
4,26-5,11 85
4,27 63
5,4-5 270
5,4-6 63
6,13-18 264
7,19-20 98
7,30-8,21 172
8,2-8 170
8,9-10 197
8,20-25 181
8,23 98
8,29-9,14 278
9,1-2 98
9,14-16 276
9,25-10,19 85, 179
10,19 85
10,19-21 264, 374
11,4-8 264

11,8-9 264
11,16 85
11,18-22 85
11,19-12,33 98
11,23-25 76
11,27-28 99
11,30-32 99
13,1-5 264
13,26-28 77
13,30-14,1 85
13,32-14,13 184
14,1-5 179
14,13-24 253
14,24-15,6 70
15,2-3 70
16,32 98
19,2-3 81
19,10-33 70
19,15-31 63
19,15-33 188
19,23 85
19,32-20,9 264
20,8-24 189
20,28-31 264
22,3-9 265
23,35-24,25 270
23,35-25,2 289
23,35-37 85
24,12 85
24,35-25,2 278
25,1-2 276
25,9-16 276
30,11-13,3 63
30,11-14 189
30,12-21 63
31,29-37 80
31,34-37 185
40,10-13 170
49,15-23 63
51,4 86

Apocryphon of John (III,1)
11,8-9 99
13,6 99
14,9-15,22 178

Authoritative Teaching
23,22-26 258
32,16-23 70

Dialogue of the Savior
122,19 285
122.19 99
127,22-128,1 88
132,15-16 258
134,19-22 258
136,17-23 92
138,16-20 195

Eugnostus
74,21-23 176
74,21-75,12 233
83,20-84,11 244
85,9-13 253
86,18-87,4 190
88,5-11 170
88,7-11 170

Exegesis on the Soul
127,25-128,1 63
132,12-26 230

Gospel of the Egyptians (III,2)
40,18 170
41,10 170
42,11-12 85
49,9-10 253
49,16-25 253
50,18-19 99
51,5-22 278
52,3-16 170
52,26 80
54,21-60,2 180
55,17-56,21 278
56,4-13 269
56,13-22 276
56,16-19 98
56,22-57,13 178
58,3-5 69
58,13-15 288
58,14-15 85
58,23-59,1 85
59,1-4 253
59,9-17 276
59,9-60,18 278
59,10-18 180
60,2-18 276
60,9-18 269
61,23-62,19 276
61,25-62,1 85
62,24-64,8 278
62,24-64,9 277
63,4-8 278
64,22-24 276
65,16-18 277, 278
67,4-6 278
68,10-12 279
69,3 85

Gospel of the Egyptians (IV,2)
60,1-2 99
65,5-6 99
66,17-18 99

Gospel of Philip
52,21-24 258
53,14-15 66, 88
53,14-20 112
53,20-21 174
53,23-54,5 235
54,34-55,1 47
56,26-57,22 297
57,21-28 250
57,28-58,2 62
59,30-34 190
60,10-15 184
60,26-32 66
62,17-26 191
62,35-63,4 47
63,30 63
66,8-16 172
66,9 112
66,13 112
67,2-9 250
67,23-26 230
67,24-30 250
69,1-70,3 230, 249
69,9-14 250
70,5-9 232
73,16-19 250
74,12-18 250
74,13-24 230
76,18-22 258
76,22-29 232
76,33-36 172
76,36 189
80,23-81,4 79
82,23-29 230

Gospel of Thomas
3 258
14 95
25 212
49 110, 258
50 110, 258
77 181
104 95
108 92
111 258

Gospel of Truth
16,5-20 179
16,31-17,4 168
17,4-13 178
17,10-11 179
17,10-36 179
18,31-19,10 168
21,11-25 257
22,18-20 258
22,27-33 170
24 171
24,55-26,39 168
30,16-32 70
31,35-32,16 242
31,36-32,14 66
34,14-16 258
41,3-7 110
43,10-14 189

Great Power, Concept of Our
38,5-9 70
45,24-47,7 193

Great Seth, Second Treatise of the
49,26-27 79
50,1-10 190
50,25-28 86
50,25-51,20 178
50,28 86
51,4-7 367
51,14-26 190
51,20-24 117
51,20-52,10 277
52,10-25 191
52,27 188
52,30-53,5 253
53,23-26 290
53,28 188
55,3 188
55,14-56,14 117
55,15-56,11 78
55,16-56,19 290
56,21-32 62
56,27-30 290
57,7-11 169
57,7-18 192
57,8 170
60,23-25 190
63,8-9 276
65,33-36 190
66,7-8 189
68,13-16 190

Hypsiphrone
70,14-17 63

Letter of Peter to Philip
135,15-20 168
135,16-22 77
136,5 77
136,7-10 70
136,16-18 189
137,18-22 190
137,21-22 257
139,15-25 78

Marsanes
4,11-12 85
8,28-29 85
9,28-10,2 234
25,17-34,19 235

Melchizedek
5,2-3 109
5,2-11 290
5,7-8 78
5,27 85
6,28-7,1 47
16,25-26 85

Nature of the Archons
86,27-32 85
87,11-14 70
87,11-88,3 70
88,3-17 70
89,17-30 270
89,31-32 263
89,31-90,11 92
89,31-90,19 265
91,34-92,3 90
92,14-17 91
92,19-93,13 90
92,21-27 257
94,1-18 178
94,4-95,5 264
94,14-15 196
94,29-39 66
94,34-95,5 264
95,5-8 98
95,5-13 85
95,5-25 85
95,13-25 194
95,19-22 289
95,35-96,3 66
96,3-5 85
96,19-22 110
96,19-32 189
97,5-9 189
97,31 189
116,33 270

Testimony of the Truth
24,9-20 180
29,22-30,17 374
29,26-27 110
29,26-30 365
30,2-17 94
30,15-17 112
32,22-24 190
33,24-34 79
34,25-38,27 285
40,25-29 180
43,10-12 66
44,3-7 285
45,14-16 169
45,23-48,26 95
47,14-50,11 71
57,6-8 75, 211
58,2-4 61
65,1-8 374
67,9-68,11 191
69,7-22 285
69,15-31 250

Treatise on the Resurrection
45,13 170
47,1-12 285

Valentinian Exposition
22,31-36 177
23,31-37 177
24,19-22 177, 215
24,21-22 177
25,22-24 180, 183
25,22-37 169, 179
26,22-26 184
26,31-34 180, 183
27,29-38 205
27,30-37 183
27,30-38 180
29,25-28 238
29,26-37 177
29,28 177
29,35-38 238
30,16-17 177
30,16-20 171, 172
30,18-19 177
30,29-38 76
30,30-38 238
31,36-37 177
33,25-32 184
33,35-37 179
34,10-34 185
34,25-31 180
34,26-28 179

34,34-39 185
35,30-37 186
37,20-31 189
37,20-35 189
37,32 168
38,24-33 277
38,25 168
38,27-33 66
39,16 168
39,28-35 192
40,18-19 189

Zostrianus
1,18 188
4,29-30 62
6,19-20 213
7,6-8 213
7,14-15 213
7,20-21 213
9,16-17 179
14,3-6 85
14,27 63
27,12 69
47,11 81
53,10 85
62,21 85
82,23-83,24 62
119,23 85
129,11 85
130,14-17 276

Other Gnostic Sources

Clement of Alexandria
Excerpta ex Theodoto
7.1-3 169
35.1 169
36.2 171
42.1-3 169

Codex Tchacos
Book of James
13,5-23 172
15,5-7 191
16,15-21 70
18,6-11 117
18,16-20 221
19,24-22,23 257
19,26-22,20 102
21,4 184
21,12-15 178
21,15-19 258
21,26 184
22,7 184
23,10-16 80
28,14-16 197

Gospel of Judas
34,6-11 285
35,17-18 63
35,18 85
37,2-8 191
38,16-19 93
40,7-16 284
40,12-13 95
43,12-44,7 285
43,15-44,4 191
49,9-50,2 76
51 98
51,15 85
52,4-6 277, 278
52,14-17 70
53,16-25 191
53,16-26 285
53,18-22 192
55,21-56,1 250
55,21f 285
56,11-13 285
56,19-20 271
57,1-11 271
57,16-23 289

Letter of Peter to Philip
3,24-27 169
4,14-17 70
6,1-3 190
8,1-5 78

Ginza
46,4-5 90
50,8-11 103
78,25-28 178, 179
88,21-34 194
100,31,1-101,5 179
107,14-15 264
136,12-13 95
174,1-6 70
176,38-177,2 110
211,36 90
211,39 90
229,20-22 94
255,5-10 285
266,18-24 188

311,37-312,9 180
356,31-38 194
360,21-370,19 194
409,4-5 91
433,36 99
443,9-11 289
465,24-27 264
467,30-31 264
482,22-483,14 189
486,14-35 189
566,18-567,23 190
583,2 190
587,22 190

Books of Jeu
2 Jeu
43 99
50 253

Johannesbuch
36,10-37,4 180
116,13-19 289
120,5-7 189
191,4-5 99
192,15-193,2 47

Manichean Kephalaia
26,15-17 212
33,33 99
63,14-15 110
72,3-6 180
77,33 99
116,13 170
124,3-6 97
191,16-17 97
210,24-25 97
212,10-22 97
228,1-12 92
236,7-27 97
269,17-25 174

Manichean Psalms
173,19-20 257
191,4-8 290

Pistis Sophia
1.7 62
1.26 285
1.26-27 99
1.27 285
1.29 77
1.30 63, 77
1.31 178, 264
1.32 185
2.63 117
2.74 180
2.84 172
2.86 172, 194
3.111 192
3.112 102, 191, 258
3.113 112
3.119 191
3.126 99
3.131 189
3.132 76, 81
3.134 368
3.135 65, 66
4.136 184
4.139 66, 99
4.140 66
4.147 94
25 97

Untitled text of the Codex Brucianus
2.12 178
3 76
6 76
7 290
9 76
10 76
19 66

Patristic Sources

Adamantius
De Recta Fide
2.10 307
2.17 308
2.18 304, 311, 313, 314
2.19 312, 314
2.20 301
4.12 310
4.14 308
5.12 310

Apostolic Constitutions
6.6.2 40
6.6.3 42, 43
6.6.5 45
6.7 61
6.7-9 61
6.8.1 39, 69
6.9.3-4 66
7.23.1 43

Augustine
Epistle
158.6 36

Clement, First Epistle of
54.1 114

Pseudo-Clementine Homilies
2.22 61
2.24 39
2.38.1 146
2.44.2 144
3.2.2 65
3.19.2 144
3.20-21 133
3.20.2 133
3.26.3 144
3.45.1-2 144
3.53.2 143
4.16.2 106
7.8.2 132
8.15.3-4 143
8.21.1-2 144
9.4-5 18
11.1.1-2 143
11.23.1 45
11.28.4 43
13.4.3 132
16.15.2 146
18.19-20 146
20.2.1-2 144
45-52 146
56.4 144

Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions
1.31.3 19
1.33-70 131
1.37 144
1.39.12 144
1.40.4 141
1.54.2-5 39
1.54.4 40
1.54.6 42
1.70-71 144
2.5-15 61
2.7 62
2.7.1 61
2.12.4 64
4.3.1 143
7.3-4 144
8.1.1 143
8.59-62 146

Didache
8.1 43

Eusebius
Chronicle
42a,28 19
61,12-14 124
206,13 377

Commentarium in Isaiam
18:1-2 134

Historia Ecclesiastica
1.6.1-2 124
1.6.2 53
1.6.2-4 53
1.6.4 124
1.6.7 53
1.6.8 124
1.7.11 53
2.1-2 125
2.12.3-15.1 61
2.17.1-24 126
2.17.4 123
2.17.8 126
2.17.16-17 126
2.17.21-22 126
2.23 125
2.23.5 125
3.5.3 129
3.24.2-4 84
3.24.6 130
3.27.1 145
3.27.2 132
3.27.3 129
3.27.4 130, 131, 133
3.29.2 84
3.31.3 125
4.7.3 69
4.7.3-4 68
4.7.3-7 75
4.7.7 79, 91
4.7.9-11 109
4.11.1 292, 294
4.11.1-2 292
4.11.2 296, 297
4.17.2 296
4.22.5 38, 39, 69
4.22.7 37, 40, 42, 45
4.29.1 377
4.29.3 376, 377
4.29.4-5 373
4.29.5 375
4.29.6 377
5.6.1-2 113
5.10.3 130
5.13.1-2 367

5.13.1-4 294
5.13.1-8 366
5.13.2 368
5.13.4 294, 296
5.13.5-7 367
6.12 290
6.38 48
16.1-17.1 126
17.14 129
39.16 130

Praeparatio Evangelica
10.9 10
10.10 21

Filaster of Brescia
Haereses
1.3 68
4 38
4.1 292
7.1 33
7.2 33
8 46
28 53
29.1 61, 62
29.1.4 61
29.2 61
29.3 61
29.4 63
29.7 62, 63
29.8 64
29.9 66
31 69, 70
31.1 69
31.2 70
31.3 70
31.4 70
31.5 70
32 75, 78
32.2 75
32.2-3 76
32.4 77
32.5-6 77
32.6 78
32.7 79
32.7-8 79
33 83
33.1 84
33.2 83, 85, 90
33.3 85, 86
33.4-5 88
33.6 91
34.1-2 271
35 109
35.1 109
35.2 109
35.3 109
36.1 116
36.2 119, 120
36.3 119
36.4-5 117
38 165
38.3-4 177
38.6 174
40 208
41 256
42 229
42.2 236
42.2-3 246
44 292
44.2 292
45 294
45.1 294, 295
45.2 295
45.3 296
45.5 302
46 292, 296
47 366
47.2 367
47.3 367
47.6 368
48 376, 377

Hippolytus
Chronicle
60 281
61 281
63 281
95 281
96 281
111 281
168 281
169 281
178 281

Refutatio Omnium Haereseon
1.19.6 24
5.6.1-11 261
5.8.4 86
5.9 92
5.16.7-8 267
5.19-22 276
6.7 61
6.7.1 61, 62
6.19.1 64
6.19.1–20.2 61
6.19.2 63, 64
6.19.3 63
6.19.3-4 62
6.19.4 62
6.19.5 99
6.19.6 61, 62

6.19.7 65
6.20.9 65
6.23.3 66
6.29-30 167
6.29.3 176
6.29.3-4 180
6.29.5 176
6.29.5-7 171
6.29.21-36 165
6.30.1-5 171
6.30.5-6 180
6.30.6-9 179
6.30.7 176
6.30.8 179
6.30.9 179
6.31.1-2 179, 181
6.31.2-3 180
6.31.2-6 185
6.31.9 194
6.32.2-5 184, 185
6.32.4 186
6.32.5-6 179
6.32.6-8 185
6.33.1 188
6.35.1 194
6.35.6 190, 256
6.35.7 190
6.36.3-4 174
6.38.1 208
6.38.2-4 212
6.38.3-5 214
6.38.5-7 214
6.39.1ff 229
6.42.2-45.1 233
6.53.5 76
6.55.3 252
7.4 68
7.15.4-6 132
7.20.1 367
7.22-23 76
7.23.1-24.7 76
7.23.7 75
7.26.2-3 83
7.26.6 80
7.26.13 78
7.27.1 294
7.28.1 69
7.28.1-2 69
7.28.2 69, 70
7.28.3 69, 70
7.28.4 70
7.28.5 71
7.28.6 71
7.28.7 71
7.29.1 294
7.30 294
7.30.3-4 296
7.31.1-2 296
7.31.2 296
7.31.6 308
7.32 109
7.32.1-3 109
7.32.5 111
7.32.7 113
7.32.8 113
7.33 116
7.34.1 128, 131
7.34.2 146
7.36.3 83, 84
7.37.1 292
7.37.2 364
7.38 366
7.38.1 366
7.38.1-2 367
7.38.2-3 366
7.38.3 367, 368
7.38.4 368
7.38.5 368
8.16.1 376, 377
8.26.6 81
9.13.1 48
9.13.1-17.3 48
9.13.4 48
9.14.1 133
9.15.1 50
9.15.2 49
9.15.3-6 34
9.15.5 49
9.28 42
9.28.5 43
9.29 40
10.2 367
10.19.1 294, 296
10.19.1-2 296
10.19.1-4 292
10.19.3 295
10.20 366
10.20.1 366
10.20.2 369
10.30.7 48

Jerome

Adversus Jovinianum
1.3 377
2.16 377

Adversus Luciferanios
23 53, 131

Chronicle
7,20 21
16,2-17 19

20,13 18
21,24 10
27,14 22
32,9 22
42,15 22
44,1 21
46,23 22
148,6-8 124
148,11-14 124
160,1-5 56
160,16-17 124

Commentarium in Galatas
1:1 134

Contra Pelagianos
3.2 130, 133

De Viris Illustribus
2 125
3 129, 130, 133

Vita Paulae
13 39

Justin Martyr
Apology
1.26.5 294
26.2 61
26.2-3 61
26.3 62
26.4 68
26.5 294
32.1-3 124
47.5-6 129
56.1-2 61

Dialogus Cum Tryphone
7 142
11.4 124
16 130
35.6 69, 109, 165
46.4-5 41
47 130
52.2-4 124
80.4 40, 42, 45
120.3-5 124
120.6 61
126.1 124

Origen
Commentariorum in Matthaeum Series
23:23 43
24:7-8 79
126 379

Contra Celsum
2.27 364
2.29 130
5.54 368
5.61 132
5.62 61, 62, 109
5.65 144
6.24-35 261
6.30 99
6.31 98, 102
6.34.1 86
6.35.2 86

Homiliae in Samuelem, Fragmentum
4 124

Tertullian
Adversus Marcionem
1.1.4 294
1.19 295
1.19.4 295
1.29.1 296
3.6.3 294
3.11 366, 367
3.15.5 295
4 302
4.9.9-10 304
4.11.10 295
4.12 297
4.12.5 305
4.17 366
4.18.1 304
4.18.7 304
4.20.7-8 305
4.21.7 305
4.22.1 305
4.22.16 305
4.23.1 305
4.25.1 305
4.26.28 305
4.27.4 306
4.27.8 306
4.28.4 306
4.29.3 306
4.29.5 306
4.29.9 306
4.29.16 306
4.30.5 307
4.33.7 307
4.34 295
4.34.10 307
4.34.15 295
4.35.4 308
4.35.6 308
4.36.4 308

4.36.9-10 308
4.40.1 309
4.42.4-5 309
4.42.6 310
4.42.7 310
4.43.4 310
4.43.5 310
4.43.6 310
5.3.10 312
5.4.8 312
5.4.12 312
5.5.5 313
5.5.10 313
5.6.12 313
5.7.3 313
5.7.10 313
5.7.12-14 313
5.8.1 314
5.8.11 314
5.10.15 295
5.11.11 314
5.13.14 311
5.14.6 311
5.17.12 311
5.17.14 311
5.18.9 312
5.18.10 314
5.19.9 312

Adversus Valentinianos
4 174
4.2 256
10.3 169
18.1 168
36 252
37 212
37-38 208
38 208
39 252

De Anima
3.4-5 63
23 110
23.1 69
23.2 109
23.3 366
32.3 369
34 61, 62
34.2 62
34.3 62
34.4 64
34.6 63
35.1-2 109
36.3 366
50 68
50.2 68

De Carne Christi
1.6-8 366
8 369
14 131, 132
18 131
24 131

De Praescriptione Hereticorum
30 174, 294, 366
33 65, 177, 366
34 366
41.1-2 296
41.5 298

De Resurrectione Mortuorum
2 297

Pseudo-Tertullian
1.1 38, 40, 42, 43, 53
1.2 61, 62, 63
1.3 68, 70
1.4 69, 70
1.5 75, 76, 77, 78, 80
1.6 83, 84, 86, 88
2.1 263, 266
2.1-4 261
2.2 263, 264
2.3 264
2.4 264, 265
2.5 269
2.6 271
2.7 277
2.7-9 276
2.8 278
2.9 277, 278
2.11 267
3 128
3.1 109
3.2 116
3.3 131, 154
4.1 177
4.1-6 165
4.2 179, 184

4.3 185
4.4 186
4.5 169, 174, 190
4.7 208, 214, 277
4.8 256
5 229
5.1 252
5.1-3 252
6.1 292, 296, 297
6.1-2 296
6.2 294, 295, 302
6.2-3 294
6.3 364
6.4 366, 367
6.4-6 366
6.5 366, 367
6.6 369
7.1 376, 377
7.5 368

SUBJECT INDEX

Abel 17, 19, 34, 194, 227, 269, 270, 271, 274, 277, 278, 279, 287, 288, 289, 297, 306, 325
Abiram 227, 270, 297
Abraham 9, 10, 12, 17, 19, 20, 26, 27, 30, 41, 47, 74, 101, 130, 133, 146, 152, 153, 156, 162, 163, 246, 279, 288, 297, 302, 307, 308, 328, 329, 330, 332, 333
Achamoth 169, 186, 189, 190, 193, 197, 256, 257, 260; creates through the Demiurge 188; passion and restoration 184 seqq., 196; salvation 192; seed of 189, 194, 198; world created from her passion 185; and see *aeon, Wisdom*
acts, progress through all human 98, 110 seqq., 270
Acts of the Apostles 128, 141; in Hebrew 133, 136
apocryphal acts of apostles 144
Adam 9, 26, 47, 60, 188, 201, 224, 261, 273, 276, 278, 289, 296, 339, 341, 353, 370; apocalypses of 96; buried on Golgotha; 379-80 is a Christian 17; is Christ 133, 164; gives divine oracle 229-30; "married his own daughter" 280; name 15; not begun on the fifth day 15; not saved 377-8; offspring of powers 271; prophet 17; repentance 378; uncircumcised 17; see *first man*
Adda(n) 43, 324
aeon/s 61, 65, 88, 165, 169, 170, 174, 177, 178, 179, 189, 181, 182, 185, 186, 187, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 205, 207, 213, 239, 241, 245, 248, 252, 253, 263, 269, 379; arithmetical explanation 241 seqq.; Colorbasian account 252-3; erring aeon 204, 207, 235-6, 242; first aeon 176; in pairs 166-7 (see also *syzygy*); Marcosian account 235; produce Jesus 181; Ptolemaean account 214-15; restoration 180-1, 235-6; Secundian account 208; suffering aeon 180, 181, 183, 184, 185, 196; thirty aeons 166, 167, 169, 181, 204, 208, 209, 234, 236, 237, 238, 241, 242, 243, 244, 246; Valentinian accounts 166-9, 176-8
alphabet all things constituted of 226; angels 233; body of Truth 234-5, 237; God 240; Jesus 238; origin 240
Amen as restoration of all things 233
angel/s 12, 21, 36, 41, 43, 47, 49, 56, 63, 69, 71, 72, 73, 80, 86, 91, 99, 105, 110, 111, 115, 118, 133, 145, 146, 148, 155, 160, 174, 187, 188, 203, 230, 233, 239, 264, 270, 271, 282, 286, 303, 307, 326, 329, 338, 339, 352; Christ an angel 28, 144; created by Simon Magus 63, 67; Demiurge 116, 187; divide the world by lot 69, 77; existence denied 12, 40; give the Law 117; God of the Jews 70, 77; human acts offered through 60, 270; in each heaven 62, 76, 284; made the heavens 76, 81; made Jesus 116; made man 63, 69, 70, 71, 72, 115, 266, 277; made the world 59, 60, 63, 67, 68, 69, 71, 77, 109, 110, 111, 115, 116, 117, 277; "officer" 113, 327; place Ham in the ark 278; produced by Womb 88; quarrel/war on each other 63, 77, 277; rebel 69; Satan/devil 71, 112-13; Savior's bodyguard 174, 181, 186, 189, 193, 194, 196; seduced 63; soul 258
apostle/s 58, 81, 100, 113, 114, 117, 122, 123, 125, 126, 127, 141, 145, 149, 152, 182, 195, 202, 206, 207, 222, 246, 251, 275, 292, 295, 302, 321, 334, 335, 345, 354, 369, 375; apocrypha in the names of 151; false apostles 119, 144; Gnostics superior to 110, 232, 338; Jewish official 134, 139; not foreign to the Law 357; same Spirit in David and the apostles 355, 356
Apostolic Constitutions 375
Aqiba 42, 228, 324
Aquila 100
archon/s 77, 86, 98, 99, 107, 113, 205, 228, 271, 284, 290, 291; children of 102; Satan/devil 273-4, 287-8; feed on souls 285; flesh belongs to 97; human acts offered to 98; made the world 69, 91, 95, 227, 297; seduced 85; speak in the prophets 95, 297

Ascension of Isaiah 284
Ascension of Paul 270
Ascents of James 144
astrology 18, 43, 44, 46
Athena 59, 64, 65, 202, 222
atoms 25
Azura 280

baptism/baptize 29, 35, 36, 46, 61, 120, 139, 141, 142, 143, 202, 228, 249, 312, 320, 361; administered by women 228, 298; daily 12, 43, 45, 46, 143, 149, 161; in the Name of the Trinity 57; of Jesus 56, 142, 157, 182, 236, 303; of the Jewish patriarch 134, 135, 136; preliminary to "redemption" 249; a power descends on Jesus at his baptism 114, 133, 142, 193, 199; repeated 228, 297; repudiated 249, 285
Barbelites 95
Barbelo 54, 63, 86, 91, 99; in the eighth heaven 85, 98; weeps 85
Barkabbas 91
Barthenos 91
Basilides 59, 69, 75, 77, 79, 80, 83, 94, 122; denies value of martyrdom 79; teaching immoral 79
body 9, 15, 17, 34, 35, 36, 39, 46, 54, 68, 89, 102, 103, 104, 106, 109, 164, 174, 189, 190, 216, 225, 231, 245, 250, 252, 256, 259, 262, 267, 268, 271, 280, 284, 290, 298, 306, 310, 313, 314, 323, 325, 329, 334, 344, 353, 359, 360, 361, 369, 370, 371, 372, 374, 379; of Adam, worn by Christ 133; of Adam, buried on Golgotha 379; of Christ, consubstantial with the Godhead 156; of Christ, brought down from heaven 60, 156, 173, 174; of Christ, has human needs 57; of Christ, made by dispensation 190, 201; of Christ, reality 290, 318, 320, 321, 330, 336, 337, 338, 367, 368; of Christ, taken from Mary 55, 370; of Christ, taken from the elements 367, 368; of Christ, united with the Godhead 56, 57, 58; of Moses 36, 100; of truth 202, 234, 235, 237, 240, 245; a prison 113, 323; spiritual 57, 174, 258, 338; transmigration from body to body 10, 22, 298; universe a body 11, 24
Borborites 59, 85, 90
bridal chamber/marriage chamber 230, 249
bride 20; Achamoth Savior's bride 177; church bride of Christ 255; soul bride of the angels 174, 192, 193, 194, 232
bridegroom 192, 230, 232, 255

Cadmus 22, 240
Cain 15, 27, 271, 272, 273, 277, 278, 279, 280, 287, 288, 297; one of three kinds of men 194; Gnostic hero 269, 271, 274; son of the devil 273, 287, 289; son of primordial man 277; son of the stronger power 227, 269, 270
cannibalism 95
carousel 110
Carpocrates 59, 60, 109, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 142, 166, 210, 211
celibacy 12, 42, 49, 89, 102, 132, 143, 294, 296, 364
centurion identified with the Demiurge 194
Cerdo 228, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296
Cerinthus 60, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 142, 154, 166
Christ 55, 98, 148, 202, 235, 261, 301; an appearance/apparition/semblance 61, 70, 78, 99, 155, 156, 290, 292, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320 321, 333, 335, 336, 337, 338, 344, 346, 353, 357, 358, 367; begotten of the Father/God 55, 73, 82, 144, 149, 201, 226, 260, 267, 268, 282, 369-70; called "angel" 28; called "prophet" 28, 29, 146; created in heaven 133, 144; descent into Hades 56, 297, 373; descended/sent from the invisible Father/"good God" 297, 362, 370; descends on Jesus 117, 133, 142, 144, 193; devil's counterpart 149-50; Ebionite accounts 132, 133, 145; Elxai's account 50, 145; fashioned/formed his flesh from Mary 55, 148, 282, 370; fullness of humanity 55 seqq., 282, 370, 372; Herod is Christ 12, 53, 54; incarnate in Adam 66, 133, 164; Nazoraean account 128; "not begotten" 144, 228; Ossaean account 50-1; opponent of the God of the Jews/intermediate God 71, 297, 363; overthrows Demiurge 293; promotion/advancement to position 60, 146; ruler of the world to come 143; Seth is Christ 277; Simon Magus is Christ 61, 282; son of the devil 367; withdraws before crucifixion 78, 117, 198; and see under *Law*

Christ, Valentinian 181, 183, 199; compounded 190; emitted by the Mother 205; forms Achamoth and leaves her 184, 186, 196, 197; "higher Christ," emanation 181, 198; name for Limit 169, 173; rectifies pleroma 180, 200; "Savior" 181; soulish Christ emitted by Demiurge 190
church 106, 143, 151, 152, 207, 231, 234, 285, 291, 294, 302, 328; bride of Christ 255; consists of Christians 111, 126, 354; dove 255; primordial 16-17, 20; soulish 191, 197; throne of David 124, 125, 126; unity of doctrine 202 seqq.; Valentinian aeon, Church 167, 171, 172, 177, 178, 181, 190, 198, 199, 200, 204, 205, 235, 239, 243, 252, 253
centurion, identified as the Demiurge 194
Clement of Alexandria 106, 125, 205, 213
Clement of Rome 113, 114, 143
Cocabe 129, 132, 143, 283
Colorbasus 166, 227, 232, 252, 253, 254, 256, 322
continence 11, 12 42, 49, 84, 89, 132, 192, 211, 322, 377
consubstantial/of one essence Son with Father 55; Christ's body with Godhead 156; Trinity 260
cross 35, 38, 56, 78, 82, 183, 196, 271, 301, 337; salvation through the cross 271, 274, 275, 334, 340; sign of the cross 136, 137, 138, 140; see *Limit*
crucifixion/suffering of Christ 35-6, 56, 75, 82-3, 120, 121, 138, 141, 201, 331, 333, 338, 368, 372, 379-80; apparent only 61, 70, 82, 353; drains weaker power 271; Christ goes to heaven without suffering 78, 117, 133; Gnostic service the "passsion" of Christ 94; only part of Christ suffers 193; proof of Christ's reality 108, 316-7, 320, 337, 341, 344; secures salvation 82, 108, 267, 271, 301, 334; Simon of Cyrene crucified 78, 79, 82, 83; see *cross*

Darkness, spiritual entity 88, 208
Dathan 227, 270, 297
David 97, 108, 140, 246; first king, Jews so named from his time 10, 26, 27, 30; inspired by a "power" 65; left in Hades by Christ 297; prophet 37, 74, 143, 146, 151, 355; throne passes to Herod 53; throne passes to the church 123 seqq.
Davides 98
decad 171, 178, 238, 240, 241, 243, 245, 246
defect/defective/deficiency 65, 67, 116, 207, 256, 258, 260, 262; supposed entity, Valentinian 164, 209, 232
Demiurge 168, 169, 174, 187, 188, 189, 190, 193, 194, 197, 205, 222, 257, 258, 259, 289, 293, 325, 326, 327, 362, 363, 365, 368, 371; angel 116; conversion 194; creates in ignorance 187, 188, 189, 243; creates Ruler of the World 188; creator of Jesus 116; emits a Christ 190; equated with Defect 168, 260; Judaeo-Christian God 204, 296, 321, 327, 342, 345, 347, 349, 370; made man 189; product of Achamoth 185, 188, 205; salvation 189, 193, 195, 198; second "first principle"/God 220, 292, 296, 299, 300, 321, 326-7, 342, 362, 363, 364, 365, 367, 370; source of an Ogdoad 169
Depth 88, 166, 167, 168, 171, 172, 176, 177, 181, 205, 214, 215, 222, 237, 247, 248, 249, 256, 260, 333, 334; Ineffable 143
devil 84, 87, 92, 93, 94, 100, 104, 106, 107, 136, 147, 262, 263, 267, 271, 276, 281, 288, 289, 303, 333-4, 374, 375; Christ's counterpart 143; deceived Adam/Eve 261, 263, 268, 273, 289; father of the Jews 272, 273; father of Cain and Abel 287; formed from Achamoth's grief 188; giver of the Law 216, 220; has a father 272; made the world 113; ruler of this world 143-4; son of the chief archon 287-8, 373-4; "third God" 296
Diatessaron, "According to the Hebews" 377
digamma 242
Diogenes 221
dispensation/provision 121, 129, 210, 217, 236, 242, 246, 326, 345, 360, 361; incarnation, passion et al. 155, 157, 202, 203, 236, 242, 275, 291, 323, 340; prepares Christ's soulish body 190, 193, 201, 239
dodecad 171, 178, 182, 239, 240, 241, 243, 244, 245, 246
Dositheus 39, 40
dove 238, 255, 267, 268; church 255;

descends upon Jesus 117, 142, 144, 158, 193, 236, 239, 269
dragon 228; archon 99; vine 374
draining of Ialdabaoth 264, 266; of the weaker power 270

Ebal 33
Ebion 131, 133, 141, 143, 148, 152, 154, 157, 158, 160, 163, 164 166; encounter with John 152; name 144, 145 origin 132
echo 234, 235, 237
elder beloved of God 241
elements 248, 367, 372
Eleutheropolis 283
Elijah 74, 101, 103, 143, 146
Elilaeus 98
Elkasaites 60, 133
Eloaeus 98
Elxai 48, 49, 51, 52, 133, 145
emit/emission/emanation 76, 80, 85, 88, 174, 177, 178, 180, 181, 182, 186, 187, 188, 193, 198, 199, 200, 204, 205, 213, 214, 215, 227, 232, 237, 238, 240, 243, 249, 252, 253, 263, 264, 291, 377; Colorbasian series of emanations 252 seqq.; Ptolemaean series 215 seqq.; Secundian series 212 seqq.; Valentinian series 166 seqq., 170 seqq., 177 seqq., 198 seqq.
emission, sexual 65, 86, 91, 94, 96, 97, 99, 103
Encratites 377
Ennoia 62, 64, 67, 85, 170, 171, 173, 176, 177, 240, 252; rendered as "Conception" 215
Epicurus 22, 25
Epiphanes 60, 85, 153, 210, 212, 214
Esau 20, 21
Essenes 11, 32, 37, 38, 55
eucharistic rites 182, 334; Borborite 93-4, 106; celebrated before catechumens 296, 298; Ebionite 143; Marcionite 296, 298; Ophite 263-4; Tatianist 377
Eusebius of Caesarea 125
Eusebius of Vercelli 134
Eutactus 283, 284
evil, origin 80, 260, 341, 343 due to Ham 278
Ezra 11, 29, 31, 37, 38

fasting Dosithean 11, 39; Ebionite 161; Jewish 12, 43, 219; Gnostic observance 219, 284, 296, 297; Gnostic repudiation 95; Samaritan 38
fate 12, 23, 24, 43, 44, 46
Father, Gnostic usage 59, 61, 71, 78, 80, 167, 177, 178, 179 180, 181, 186, 200, 204, 205, 216, 221, 232, 234, 235, 238, 247, 250, 253, 257, 258, 266 (and see below); associated with Truth 171, 172, 186, 235, 239, 240, 248; Demiurge 187; Depth 260; Father of all 59, 60, 65, 76, 94, 98, 109, 115, 215, 216, 219, 221, 230, 239, 240, 249, 254, 260, 265, 285; of Barbelo 85; of Jesus 78, 292; on high 59, 71, 116, 148, 227, 254, 256, 260, 264, 265, 266; "good" 203, 220-1, 248; "Man" 171, 256; perfect 202, 216, 220; source of aeons 171, 180, 198, 199, 215, 233, 252, 253, 256, 257; unknowable, unknown et al. 69, 109, 110, 116, 117, 179, 180, 187, 240, 247, 248, 249, 287, 293, 297
fire 11, 48, 90, 140-1, 133; at the consummation 199, 351; element 243; foreign to God 50; lust 210-11; made from Achamoth's ignorance 189
first emanation 177, 198, 240; alone comprehends the Father 178, 180; reveals the Father to himself 233
first man (not named) animatd from on high 70; created by angels 69, 7l, 264; recognizes the Father 264; two first men 71, 277; see *Adam*
first principle/s 80, 81, 109, 176, 177, 212, 213, 221, 228, 259, 299, 343, 357, 361, 366, 367, 377; two 227, 228, 292, 293, 296, 299, 327, 343, 366; three 90, 228, 296, 298, 300, 327, 360-1, 362, 363, 366
First Progenitor 176, 177, 178, 181, 232, 234, 237, 247, 252, 253
flesh 92, 100, 108, 147, 148, 149, 201, 239; Adam's garment of skin 189; Christ's advent/coming/sojourn in flesh 55, 60, 323, 324, 328, 340; Christ fashioned/formed his flesh 48, 55, 82, 282, 372; guarantee of Christ's reality 71, 318, 319, 335, 337, 344; made by the weaker power 297; man of flesh distinguished from man of earth 245; natural and essential 212; not evil *per se* 340-1; not raised 65,

87 227, 228, 297; not taken by Christ 78, 94; not to be eaten 60, 322; repudiated 60; soul is in the flesh 322
Flora 61, 215, 216, 221, 223, 226
free agency 272, 341, 365
fringes 12, 41, 42

Gadara 136
genealogy of Jesus 30-1, 119, 142
gentiles 28, 29, 64, 118, 124, 130, 151, 204, 297, 342, 355; delivered from Hades 297; gentile Herod inherits David's throne 53, 124; ignorance of 64; not allowed in Jewish towns 140; not to be touched 11, 34, 132; Paul alleged to be gentile 152
Gerizim 33
God/s 19, 24, 35, 67, 73, 88, 128, 209, 153, 247, 290; gods of the Greek pantheon 10, 19, 59, 106, 170, 222, 350; evil/bad God 221, 228, 292, 294, 298, 299, 301, 362, 364, 367, 370, 371; "good" God in Gnostic sense 220, 221, 248, 289, 292, 293, 296, 298, 299, 300, 301, 325, 326, 327, 330, 347, 362, 363, 364, 367, 371, 373; intermediate "just" God 216, 221, 224, 228, 347, 364; second, created God 367; unity of God 28, 33, 71, 73, 81, 88 128, 141, 184, 200, 209, 228, 248, 251, 260, 280, 303 346, 349; see *monarchy, Father*
Gospel according to Matthew in Hebrew 130, 133, 136, 141; used by Cerinthians 119
Gospel of Eve 92
Gospel of Judas 270
Gospel of Perfection 92
Grace, proper name 176, 230

Ham 14, 15, 278, 279, 281
Harmony 284
Hasmonaeus, sons of 223
heaven 11, 23, 24, 45, 49, 62, 63, 65, 67, 99, 102, 142, 145, 154, 155, 168, 239, 240, 244, 265, 270, 286, 287, 290, 321, 322, 341; multiple heavens 59, 60, 62, 65, 73, 76, 77, 81, 85, 86, 97, 98, 166, 167, 168, 169, 187, 188, 189, 237, 238, 243, 244, 248, 250, 254, 258, 263, 264, 270, 284, 285, 321, 373
hebdomad 187, 189, 237, 258, 289
Helen 59, 62, 63, 64, 65
Hellenism 9, 10, 16, 18, 19, 20, 25, 26
Heracles 201, 202
Herod 16, 53, 54, 56, 124, 142, 157
Herodians 12, 52, 53, 54
Hesiod 166, 167, 168, 169, 222
Hicesius 222
Hippolytus 205
Homer 60, 64, 201, 202, 205
homosexual behavior 100-1, 102, 119, 212
Horaia 279

Ialdabaoth 85, 86, 96, 98, 263, 264, 265, 266, 374
idolatry/idol/image 9, 16, 19, 22, 24, 25, 31, 33, 47, 50, 53, 59, 60, 68, 112, 130, 156, 163, 191, 206, 211, 222, 240, 241, 261, 281, 341, 347, 348, 350, 355; Adam no idolater 17; permitted during persecution 49, 50; origin 9, 18; Samaritan 31, 33; Simonian 65
impassibility, divine 55, 56, 180, 193, 274, 301
incarnation/sojourn/coming of Christ (ἐνανθρώπησις, ἐνδημία, ἔνσαρκος παρουσία)[1] 29, 40, 48, 52, 55, 56, 58, 66, 96, 148, 155, 160, 262, 288, 301, 302, 315, 316, 324, 328, 340, 343, 346, 349, 372, 380; and see under *body*
intermediate region 172, 173, 188, 189, 192, 193, 194, 195, 198
Irenaeus 81, 165, 175, 205, 207, 213, 229, 231, 233
Isaac 20, 21, 27, 41, 47, 74, 133, 146, 153, 297, 302, 328
Isidore 60, 210, 211, 214

Jacob 10, 12, 20, 21, 26, 27, 30, 34, 41, 47, 74, 133, 146, 153, 159, 246, 297, 302, 324
Jairus' daughter 195
Jared 15

[1] The idea is most commonly represented by some form of the verb ἐνανθρωπέω. See Collatz, *Epiphanius IV.*

Jeconiah 30, 31
Jesus Jesus/Savior is the product of aeons 181, 182, 192, 253; Jesus as a six letter name, diagamma 236-7, 239; as Limit, Cross 169, 173; "mere man"/offspring of Joseph 109, 116, 117, 121, 132, 133, 142, 144, 147, 148, 155, 157, 158, 164; origin from alphabet 238-9; and see *body, Christ, incarnation*
Jessaeans 123, 126, 128
Jews 10, 16, 17, 26, 27, 61, 71, 77, 80, 99, 128, 130, 131, 136, 150, 223, 264, 272, 273, 274, 287, 290, 296, 297, 298, 334; circumcision 10, 17, 27, 156; crypto-Christianity 133, 138; have lost place in the Kingdom 29, 328, 356, 357; reason for the name 26, 30; summary of customs 29
John the apostle 121, 151, 198, 199, 200, 201; Gospel in Hebrew 133, 136, 141
John the Baptist 1, 102, 142, 148, 157, 248, 297; abstained from meat and wine 127, 147; defended 96; inspired by many spirits 95; older than Jesus 96, 317
Joseph of Arimathea 339, 340, 374
Joseph, husband of Mary 127, 128; alleged to be Jesus' father, see under *Jesus*; in the position of father to Jesus 158; no relations with Mary 56, 121
Joseph, son of Jacob 21, 27, 34, 35, 36, 107
Josephus of Tiberias 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140

Kaulakau 59, 86, 87

languages 17, 281, 349-50
Laodiceans, Epistle to 360
last letter (Marcosian) 234
Law 12, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37, 41, 42, 48, 50, 119-20, 129, 130, 138, 139, 151, 154, 158-9, 161, 183, 206, 212, 215, 222, 224, 251, 271, 280, 290, 301, 321, 324, 330, 335, 336, 342, 344-5, 348, 350, 351, 355-6, 356-7, 358; abolished/annulled 219, 220, 316, 362; divided into three parts 217, 218, 220, 223, 226; fulfilled/perfected by/in Christ 66, 74, 129, 135, 218, 220, 335, 336, 351, 354, 356, 360; given by angels 117; given by an inferior being 65, 216, 218, 220, 292, 293, 352; given by Christ 66, 293, 321, 346, 351; Law a pedagogue/guardian 28, 29, 335; is of God (not of someone else) 66, 223, 224, 315, 316, 318, 321, 344-5, 347, 352, 354, 356, 357, 361; mixed with evil 218-19, 220, 225; natural law 10, 18, 263; not foreign to Christ/Gospel 74, 155, 290, 318, 320, 321, 322, 335, 339, 344, 340, 344, 354, 358; observed by sectarians 12, 32-33, 37, 51, 60, 126, 128, 132; prophesies Christ 29, 58, 66, 329, 340, 342, 354, 356, 359; Ptolemy's account of the Law 216 seqq.; repudiation of Law 60, 104, 146, 227, 228, 297; typical Law 29, 35, 162, 218, 219, 226, 343, 344
Levites 102
Levitics 85
Light 64, 69, 70, 88, 142, 196, 200, 201, 203, 213, 221, 230, 245; Valentinian aeon or concept 167, 169, 171, 172, 173, 184, 185, 186, 190, 208, 209, 243, 250
lost sheep 64, 197
Lot 339, 351
Lucian, Arian 364
Lucian, disciple of Marcion 364, 366
Luke 58 Gospel of 360

magic/sorcery 18, 59, 61, 62, 68, 111, 112, 115, 136, 137, 140, 141, 229, 230, 231, 252, 265, 291
Majesty 170, 171, 172, 177, 179, 230, 247, 250
Man/man 188, 189, 197, 236, 237, 239, 243, 245, 246; aeon 171, 172, 177, 178, 199, 200, 204, 205, 235, 239, 243, 252, 253; framed by dispensation 239; inner/spiritual man 189, 190, 230 246, 250, 251; Son of Man, Gnostic title 239, 253, 254; supreme God called "Man" 253, 254; see *Adam, first man, Son of Man*
Manichaeans 128, 157, 158, 322, 354
Manichaeus 136
Marcellina 60, 113, 114
Marcion 128, 228, 293, 294-6, 296, 298, 299, 302; canon of scripture 302-3
Marcionites 128, 158, 294, 361
Marcus 227, 229, 231, 232, 234, 235, 236, 237, 239, 240, 252, 256, 257
Mark 58 preached in Egypt 126

marriage/matrimony/wedlock 211; Ebionite 145-6; forbidden 105-6, 364, 365, 377, 378; is of Satan 71, 74; permissible 67, 205, 211-12; "redemption" as spiritual marriage 249; repeated 145-6; required 145; to sisters 280
Marthus and Marthana 49
Martiades and Marsanes 292
martyr/martyrdom/perfecting 83, 228, 352, 364, 372, 376, 377; alleged not necessary 49, 79
matter 11, 24, 25, 174, 180, 185, 186, 187, 189, 190, 195, 197, 207, 259, 263, 269; alleged to be contemporary with God 23; cannot be saved 190; evil thoughts are "matter" 259
Menander 59, 68, 69, 109
Meropes 10, 17
Mind/mind 11, 22 aeon 76, 80, 167, 169, 170, 177, 179, 181, 203; human mind of Christ 55, 57, 58; perfect Mind 296
monarchy 28, 38, 71, 79, 377
Moses 21, 27, 28, 100, 101, 153, 196, 216, 244, 245, 246, 288, 297, 321, 324; apocrypha in the name of 279; at the Transfiguration 74, 320, 321, 335; gives God's Law 10, 28, 31, 33, 36, 66, 129, 223, 224, 266, 272, 280, 298, 349; makes laws on his own initiative 217-18, 223; "repetitions" in the name of 42, 223
Mother/mother 91, 171, 180, 185, 193, 222, 232, 237, 238, 243, 249, 256, 258, 265, 266, 277, 278, 319; Achamoth/(lower) Sophia 169, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 192, 193, 197, 204, 205, 260; Barbelo 85, 99; creates through the Demiurge 187, 188, 243; drains Ialdabaoth 264; dwells in the eighth heaven 99, 188-9, 192, 194, 284, 285; inspires some prophecies 194; lost sheep 197; Mother and Female 277, 278; Mother of all 238, 244, 249, 256, 277, 282; of Ialdabaoth/Sabaoth/Demiurge 85, 188, 268; Ogdoad 187, 188, 200, 242; plants her power in Seth 277; produces Seth 227, 277; sends the Flood 278
mystery/ies 164, 170, 172, 173, 174, 176, 178, 182, 183, 191, 192, 198, 223, 241, 246, 247, 253, 263, 265, 282, 295, 340, 380; Gnostic rite 65, 68, 80, 85, 250, 266; pagan rite 9, 22, 114; sacrament 46, 57, 134, 143, 164, 268, 285, 296, 298, 334, 377

Nasaraeans 127, 131
Nazoraeans 60, 123, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131, 132; cursed by Jews 130
New Testament 82, 122, 133, 271, 324, 353, 357, 358; agrees with/fulfills Old Testament 66, 74, 315, 340, 345, 349, 351, 352, 357, 358, 365; alleged foreign to Old Testament 228, 355; used exclusively 364; used together with Old Testament 95, 128, 227; see *Old Testament*
Nicolaus 59, 83, 86, 88, 89, 90, 92, 109, 261, 270
Nimrod 18
Noah 9, 15, 16, 26, 47, 90, 146, 246, 278, 279, 280; ark burned 91; Christian 17; Christ the true Noah 162; left in Hades 297; obedient to the archon 91; remains of the ark 48; see *Noria*
Noria Noah's wife 90, burns ark 91
number, runaway (Marcosian) 235-6

oaths 45, 52; Elxai's 48-9, 145; God's oath to David 123
ogdoad 165, 168, 169, 172, 173, 177, 178, 182, 187, 188, 198, 200, 201, 204, 208, 213, 214, 227, 236, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 252, 253, 254, 256, 258, 284
Orpheus 22, 169, 222
Ossaeans 48, 52, 54, 55, 131, 145

Panarion 3; its sources 14
parables as used by Gnostics 178, 183, 195, 197, 206-7
Paradise 188, 262, 263, 337, 362, 378, 379
Passover 38, 47, 95, 126, 161, 219, 220, 335, 344, 349; eaten by Christ 149, 150, 334
patriarch/s 12, 20, 21, 30, 47, 53, 121, 133; Jewish official 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139; left in Hades 297-8
Pentateuch 11, 12, 27, 223; Moses' authorship denied 12, 47; received by Samaritans 11, 33, 37; rejected 47, 146
persecution 135, 163, 259, 268

Peter alleged to abstain from meat, bathe daily 143
Peter the Gnostic 283
Pharisees 12, 42, 43, 44, 45, 52, 54
Phibionites 59, 85, 93, 98
Philistion 64, 91, 221
Philo of Alexandria 126
phylacteries 12, 41, 42
pleroma 66, 167, 169, 177; 178, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 186, 187, 188, 192, 193, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 204, 205, 210, 214, 237, 244, 251, 255, 257, 259
polytheism 24, 88, 222, 261, 348
power/s 63, 81, 86, 91, 115, 117, 141, 164, 182, 184, 186, 189, 204-5, 208, 210, 214, 232, 235, 236, 237, 239, 240, 243, 244, 249, 250, 253, 254, 260, 264, 278, 279, 282, 285, 286, 367, 374; aeon 76, 80, 204-5, 213, 214; angelic/supernatural being 62, 65, 69, 76, 77, 78, 80, 81, 91, 102, 264, 271, 279, 351; drained/emptied 264, 277; gathered/recovered 63, 85, 86, 91, 97; lefthand power 65, 66, 228; Limit 179, 182, 183; Mother's power in Seth 277; powers give prophecies 65; powers have intercourse with Eve 270, 271; powers in each heaven 65, 77, 78; power on high 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 80, 81, 91, 102, 109, 260, 277, 289, 293, 374; powers sent to Jesus' soul/any soul 110, 115; Prunicus/Barbelo 63; stronger/weaker power 227, 269, 270, 271, 282; Simon/Menander a power of God 61, 62, 66, 68
prophet/s 17, 20, 28-9, 53, 60, 128, 143, 160, 161, 194, 195, 202, 204, 206, 222, 292, 321, 324, 330, 339, 342, 350, 369; accepted by John's Gospel 151; Barkabbas 91; Elxai 48, 133; in agreement with Gospel, Christ et al. 73, 74, 75, 149, 155, 253, 298, 302, 313, 317, 318, 324, 329, 333, 334, 335, 342, 354, 355, 361; Marcosian 230-1; Martiades and Marsianus 290; repudiated 12, 33, 37, 65, 66, 101, 104, 117, 143, 146, 151, 293, 297, 320, 330; see under *Adam, Christ, Law*
providence 10, 11, 25, 189, 201, 208, 216
Prunicus 59, 62, 63, 86, 87, 263, 264, 266
Ptolemy 166, 214, 215, 221, 226, 227, 229, 252
Pyrrha 90, 91
Questions of Mary 96

rapture of Cain and others 269; of Seth 289
redemption 232, 282; Gnostic rite 249, 250, 251, 258
(re)incarnation of soul 112, 113, 298, 322
Resolve/Purpose (i.e., Achamoth) 179, 180, 182, 184, 185, 187, 197, 204, 237
restoration of all things 233
resurrection 11, 12, 33, 38, 43, 117, 120, 128, 209, 138, 246, 262, 302, 303, 323, 353, 378, 380; Apellean account 368-70, 372; defended 34, 41, 75, 120, 121, 290, 298, 328, 332, 338, 353, 359, 372, 380; denied 11, 12, 14, 33, 59, 60, 97, 104, 120, 121, 227, 228, 291, 369; of soul only 65, 114, 285, 297, 298, 380; of spiritual body 334
right/left hand 65, 88, 187, 190, 209, 242, 287

Sabbath 11, 28, 37, 39, 46, 51, 128-9, 132, 144, 145, 161, 164, 316; abolished by Jesus 161; fasting on Sabbath 296; not consistently observed by Jews 162; typical/temporary 29, 129, 162, 219, 226, 360
sacrifice 10, 28, 40, 43, 50, 51, 114, 161, 162, 191, 210, 211, 246, 347; defended 146; forbidden 47, 50, 144; fulfilled in Christ 349; indecent 65, 98, 105; offered through archons/angels 98; Ophite 265; typical/temporary 29, 344, 348, 349
Sadducees 40, 41, 52, 54 deny existence of angels 12, 40; deny resurrection 12, 40-1, 45
Saklas 98
Samaritans 11, 12, 31, 32, 33, 37, 39, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 68, 131, 132, 140, 163, 376; have only the Pentateuch 11, 37; many not touch gentiles 34 deny resurrection 11, 42
Sampsaeans 44, 55, 60, 133
Satornilus 59, 69, 70, 71, 72 73, 74, 75, 76, 109, 166, 292
Saue 280
Savior/Advocate, Valentinian 169, 173, 181, 182, 187, 189, 192, 193, 194, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201; creates through

Achamoth 186, 187, 199; gives form to Achamoth's passions 186
Scribes 12, 41, 42, 43, 45, 52, 54
scriptural sayings/prophecies variously inspired 65-6, 194, 368
Scythianism 10, 19, 20
Sebuaeans 32, 37, 38, 55
Secundians 59, 61, 210
seed 85, 94, 103, 123, 124, 125, 159, 173, 176, 206, 230, 234, 277, 331; Christ of/not of man's seed 55, 109, 116, 117, 121, 132, 142, 144, 158, 160, 161, 367; of Achamoth sown through the Demiurge 189-90, 192, 193, 194, 195, 197; of the angels 278; of Defect 232; of Depth 177, 178; of the devil 287, 289; of the light 230; of "the Mother" 277
Serug 9, 18, 20, 26
Seth 194, 227, 276, 277, 278, 279, 290; archon 98; books in the name of 96; rapture 289
seven angels 59, 69; authorities 287; books in Seth's name 279; heavens 85, 98, 168, 169, 187, 243, 258, 264, 284; letters/values 235, 236, 237, 238, 242; sons of Ialdabaoth 264; sons of Seth 289-90; spirits 88; vowels 235, 237
sexual immorality 59, 62-3, 65, 79, 86, 92, 94, 95, 96-7, 100, 101, 110, 111, 112, 191-2, 231, 270, 284; temptation of Epiphanius 106-7
shadow 205
Silence 167, 168, 170, 171, 172, 173, 176, 177, 178, 180, 204, 214, 232, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 256
Simon of Cyrene 78, 82, 83
Simon Magus 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 66, 67, 68, 71, 76, 79, 89, 109, 115, 292
sleep, deprivation 42-3
snake/serpent 87, 97, 227, 262, 265, 267, 268, 273, 289, 374; cast down from heaven 265; deceived Eve 192, 261, 262, 266, 268, 273; deified/identified with Christ 227, 261, 262, 265, 266; devil 261, 262, 263, 267, 268, 373-4; kept by Ophites 227, 265-6; lifted up in the wilderness 266-7; sired the vine 323-4; son of Ialdabaoth 264-5, 373-4
Socratists 59
Sodomites 227, 271, 341
Son of Man, Gnostic interpretation 97, 196, 239, 253, 254, 267
Sophia see *Wisdom*
soul/s 11, 22, 34, 36, 82, 86, 92, 93, 110, 113, 115, 116, 169, 174, 185, 188, 190, 193, 194, 195, 196, 211, 231, 237, 250, 257, 297, 324, 326, 349, 353, 371; "angel" 258; before the judge/archons 113, 291; created by Demiurge 189, 190, 194; departure/ascent 99, 102, 113; eaten by archons 99, 285; good/evil by nature 195; involved with matter 259; must perform all acts 110, 111; of Jesus 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 110, 282, 370, 372; one soul in all beings 97, 323; resurrection of 65, 114, 285, 297, 298, 354; reincarnation/transmigration 10, 11, 22, 23, 24, 112, 113, 298; rest in the Intermediate Region 193, 195; rise above archons 99, 113; spark 70
soulish 187, 188, 189, 193, 201, 249, 250, 254, 259; soulish Christ 190, 193; Demiurge 187, 188, 197; persons 170, 174, 190, 191, 192, 194, 196, 197
speech of defense before the archons 102-3, 232, 257, 258
Spirit/spirit/s 12, 25, 33, 36, 43, 49, 55, 56, 57, 58, 82, 88, 95, 102, 103, 111, 117, 133, 142, 152, 156, 157, 162, 188, 189, 193, 194, 197, 202, 209, 232, 233, 241, 245, 246, 252, 253, 262, 270, 335, 343, 358, 360, 367, 372, 380; Achamoth called Holy Spirit 188; boundary between Light and Darkness 88; created in heaven 60, 188; conferred through laying on of hands 61, 62; female 50, 145, 188; Helen 62-3, 66; identical in both Testaments 66, 323, 357; not known of 33, 40; Prunicus 62-3; splits the universe 25; Valentinian aeon 173, 179, 180, 181, 184, 225, 253; see *Trinity*
spiritual 155, 187, 188, 189, 190, 192, 193, 197, 218, 219, 220, 249, 251, 259, 289, 335, 345, 346; Achamoth is spiritual 189; spiritual body 174; embryo 187; essence 180, 187, 205; intercourse 172; "man" 189, 190, 246, 250, 260; marriage 249; persons 174, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 196, 197; pleroma 167, 178; risen Christ 57, 58, 338, 372; seed 193, 194; tetrad 171; Word 172
Stesichorus 167, 169, 222

Stranger/s names of books 279, 284, 290; Seth 289
Stratiotics 59, 85, 93, 94
synagogue, Ebionite 148
syzygy 180, 192, 198, 199, 204 see *aeon*

Tatian 228, 376, 378, 379
Terah 9, 18, 19, 26
tetrad/s 171, 172, 177, 182, 198, 200, 204, 212, 236, 237, 238, 239, 243, 244, 245; appears to Marcus 232, 234, 235; left/righthand tetrads (Secundian) 208, 209
three classes of persons 174, 191, 194-5, 196-7
three hundred sixty-five archons 98; days 81; gods 169; heavens 76, 81; members 81; sexual offenses 98
triacad 172
triacontad 241, 242, 244, 245, 246
Trinity/Father, Son and Holy Spirit 9, 17, 79, 162, 202 209, 251, 260, 321; baptism in the Name of 57-8; in creation 260, 369-70; proclaimed in the Law 28, 33
Trojan horse 64
two first men 71, 245-6, 279

Valentinians location 179
Valentinus 60, 61, 109, 136, 166, 173, 176, 204, 205, 207, 228, 212, 227, 229, 233, 253, 270, 322, 377
virgin 121, 147, 148, 228, 297, 377-8; Borborite practice 101; Dositheian practice 39; "elders and virgins" 132; and see *celibacy, Virgin Mary*
Virgin Mary 116, 123, 124, 125, 148, 154, 159, 160, 292, 331, 341; Birth of Mary 101; Christ took/fashioned flesh from 55, 155, 254, 337, 370; "ever-virgin" 90, 128, 282; "Gnostic" treatment 99; Marcosian treatment 239; no labor pains 148; no relations with Joseph 55, 121; prophetess 160, 161; spotless 160; Valentinian treatment 60, 161, 178, 193; see under *seed*

wife/wives 94, 158, 182, 217, 280, 337; Joseph's other wife 121, 125; wife of Adam 15, 234; of Ahaz 160, 161; of Nicolaus 59, 84; of Noah 90, 91; wives to be held in common 93, 211
wine 93, 229, 230, 295; abstinence from 127, 147; forbidden 228, 374
Wisdom/Sophia 76, 80, 106, 167, 171, 172, 177, 206, 237, 258, 269; Achamoth 169, 184, 188, 189, 192, 198; Thirtieth Valentinian aeon 178, 179, 180, 186, 197
Word "divine Word" 83, 148, 157, 160, 163, 267, 268, 282, 370; Gnostic aeon or entity 167, 169, 171, 172, 173, 174, 177, 181, 184, 198, 199, 200, 201, 233, 234, 235, 237, 239, 240, 243, 248, 252, 253

Zacchaeans 59, 93
Zacharias 101, 102, 142
Zadok 12, 40
Zeno 22, 23, 24
Zeus 10, 19, 43, 59, 65, 106, 170, 215, 222, 350
zodiac 43, 243, 244
Zoroaster 18

Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 79

The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis, Books II and III. *De Fide*

Second, revised edition

Translated by

Frank Williams

BRILL

The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis
Books II and III. *De Fide*

Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies

Editors

Johannes van Oort & Einar Thomassen

Editorial Board

J.D. BeDuhn, A.D. DeConick, W.-P. Funk
I. Gardner, S.N.C. Lieu, A. Marjanen
P. Nagel, L. Painchaud, B.A. Pearson
N.A. Pedersen, S.G. Richter, J.M. Robinson
M. Scopello, J.D. Turner, G. Wurst

VOLUME 79

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/nhms

The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis
Books II and III. *De Fide*

Second, revised edition

Translated by

Frank Williams

BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2013

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Epiphanius, Saint, Bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, approximately 310-403.
[De fide. English]
The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis. Books II and III, De fide / translated by Frank Williams. — Second, revised edition.
pages cm. — (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean studies ; volume 79)
Includes index.
ISBN 978-90-04-22841-2 (hardback : alk. paper)—ISBN 978-90-04-23312-6 (e-book)
1. Christian heresies—Early works to 1800. 2. Apologetics—Early works to 1800. I. Title.

BR65.E653P36513 2012
273'.4—dc23

2012031957

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual "Brill" typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see www.brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0929–2470
ISBN 978-90-04-22841-2 (hardback)
ISBN 978-90-04-23312-6 (e-book)

Copyright 2013 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Global Oriental, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers and Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

CONTENTS

(Most sections of the work are titled as in the manuscripts. Modern titles are indicated with an asterisk.)

Acknowledgments vii

Translator's Introduction ix

Abbreviations xiii

Works Cited xvii

*Anacephalaeosis IV 1
47. Against Encratites 3
48. Against those who are called Phrygians or Montanists 6
49. Against Quintillianists or Pepuzians 22
50. Against Quartodecimans 24
51. Against the sect which does not accept the Gospel according to John, or his Revelation 26
52. Against Adamians 68
53. Against Sampsaeans 71
54. Against Theodotians 73
55. Against Melchizidekians 78
56. Against Bardesianists 88
57. Against Noetians 91
58. Against Valesians 100
59. Against the impure "Purists" (Cathari) 104
60. Against Angelics 115
61. Against Apostolics 116
62. Against Sabellians 123
63. Against the first type of Origenist, who are shameful as well 130
64. Against Origen, also called Adamantius 134

*Anacephalaeosis V 215
65. Against Paul the Samosatian 216
66. Against Manichaeans 226
67. Against Hieracites 316
68. Against the schism of Melitius the Egyptian 324
69. Against the Arian Nuts 333

*Anacephalaeosis VI 411
70. On the schism of the Audians 412
71. Against Photinians 428
72. Against Marcellians 433
73. Against Semi-Arians 443
74. Against Pneumatomachi 483
75. Against Aerius 504
76. Against Anomoeans 511

*Anacephalaeosis VII 581
77. Against Dimoerites, called Apollinarians by some 582
78. Against Antidicomarians 616
79. Against Collyridians 637
80. Against Massalians 646
**De Fide* 655

Index 683

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I need to thank my daughter Marge, who scanned the book from which I worked; Mattie Kuiper, Tessel Jonquière, Wilma de Weert and Rizalyn Rafael of Brill for their patience and help; Dr. Hans van Oort for his valuable suggestions; my indexer Dan Connolly and especially my wife Charlotte, for her considerable technical help and for the constant encouragement which is much needed in a work of this sort.

TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

Here, in response to numerous requests, is our revised version of Books II and III of the Panarion along with *De Fide*, Epiphanius' summary of the catholic faith as he understood it.

A great deal need not be said by way of introduction. The text from which this is made is again Holl's, with notes completed after his death by his grateful pupil Hans Lietzmann. We have used Dummer's reedition, which includes various suggestions for the improvement of Holl's text. For Epiphanius' life and work and our defense of him, the reader is referred to the introduction to our Book I, the second edition, Brill, 2007. The style of Books II and III is perhaps marginally better than that of Book I; Epiphanius quotes a number of better educated authors, some of his own writing is formal, and he is discussing contemporary controversies with which he was involved. However, the same criticisms which apply to the rest of the Panarion, apply here.

The content is of particular interest to the patrologist, church historian, theologian, student of Gnosticism or Manichaeism, and the Christian with theological interests, because it represents the Christian fourth century as described by an active participant. Politically the church was triumphant and exercised considerable control over the lives of its people. The monastic movement was new, on the rise and very important. Internally, however, the church seethed with controversy, deathly serious, with all parties convinced that the right answer was available in an infallible, self-interpreting scripture, and that one's eternal salvation depended upon understanding it.

Because Epiphanius was on the winning side we have the Panarion entire. Its comprehensiveness undoubtedly made it an important weapon for the group which gained control of the church.

As the years between 325 and 381 were crucial to the Arian problem which the Council of Nicaea had failed to settle, this is given significant space in the Panarion's Books II and III. Five long Sects—or eight if we count the brief notices of Theodotianists, Sabellians and Noetians—deal with some aspect of it, a total of 122 pages out of 682. Three Sects deal with the date of Easter—again, this was dealt with at Nicaea[1] but the

[1] See Eusebius' fragmentary *De Pascha*, PG 24, 643ff., translated in Strobel pp. 24–25.

compromise it reached may not have been fully adopted when Epiphanius wrote. Other topics prominent in the Panarion are the divinity and personality of the Holy Spirit, celibacy, Mary's perpetual virginity and the resurrection of the body. All these were hot issues in Epiphanius' time and account roughly for four fifths of Books II and III.

The longest Sect is Epiphanius' attack on the Manichaeans, in his day active and a serious competitor of the church. Its length, however, is due in part to his fictitious biography of Mani, in part to his paraphrase of and partial quotation from the *Acta Archelai disputationis cum Manete disputantis*.

The quotation of other works is an important feature of the Panarion. There were several in Book I; in Books II and III there are no less than fourteen, many not available elsewhere. In addition there are two self-quotations: a long passage from the Ancoratus and Epiphanius' Letter to Arabia about Mary.

As to his refutations of the various sects, Epiphanius takes these where he finds them. Sometimes we know the source: his reply to Noetus comes from Hippolytus, his strictures against the Phrygians from one of several possible sources. His own are not bad. His voice is most recognizable, either in arguments drawn from simple commonsense—as when he asks how Mani's archons can lock the soul in the prison of the body after eating it—or in his dealings with scripture. These latter can be impressive. His answers to Arius' arguments—barring a few forced explanations—are quite effective. Even his refutation of Aetius' Treatise on the Ingenerate and Generate, though it makes no real attempt to take issue with the dialectic, is a reasonable Christian response.

Also of interest is the picture Epiphanius incidentally gives of the first century church. It is interesting and important to know how Holy Week was kept, how a monk dressed, the not entirely successful attempts to enforce clerical celibacy, the severe regulations concerning fasting. Only Epiphanius explains why a priest should wear a beard, or gives the names, not of all but of several of the parish churches in Alexandria. To him also we owe descriptions of some of the pagan celebrations he abhorred.

While, read through, the Panarion is monotonous and repetitious, some passages show real imagination. Thus, at the conclusion of his condemnation of the Cathari, Epiphanius, not unsympathetically, portrays the position of the sectarian: "It is < as though > one found a break in a wall beside a highway, thought of going through it, left the road and turned off < there >, in the belief that a place where he could turn and pick up the road again was right close by. But he did not know that the wall was very

high and ran on for a long way; (3) he kept running into it and not finding a place to get out, and in fact went for more than a signpost, or mile, further without reaching the road. And so he would turn and keep going, tiring himself out and finding no way to get back to his route; and perhaps he could never find one unless he went back to the place where he had come in (44,12,2–3)." Epiphanius would have been an effective preacher.

This revision has been concerned chiefly with the translation and index. The translation has been carefully reviewed, its errors corrected, and it has been tightened in the sense of being made more literal—not, we hope, at the expense of readability. The notes have been enlarged, by adding a few more lemmata, but chiefly by increasing the number of entries. As to the notes themselves, these have only been minimally changed. Errors have been corrected, a few more recent editions have been used, and the bibliography slightly updated. However considerations of time preclude any thorough revision of the notes.

Although great care has been taken, there will still be errors; the translator apologizes for them. Experience has proved this translation helpful to many. We hope it will continue to be so in the future.

Frank Williams
Las Cruces, New Mexico
October 10, 2011

ABBREVIATIONS

Act. Arch.	*Acta Archelai cum Manete Disputantis*
Act. Perpet.	*Acta Perpetuae*
A-F	Achelis-Flemming
Alex. Lycop.	Alexander of Lycopolis
Anc.	*Ancoratus*
APAW	*Abhandlungen der Königlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Berlin
Apol. Ep. Dion.	Apollinaris *Epistula ad Dionysium*
App.	Appendix
Asc. Isa.	*Ascension of Isaiah*
Ath.	Athanasius
Ap. De Fuga	*Apologia de Fuga*
Ap. Sec.	*Apologia Secunda*
C. Apol.	*Contra Apollinarem*
De Sent. Dion	*De Sententiis Dionysii*
Dial. II Trin.	*Dialogus Secundus De Trinitate*
Ep. Ad Serap	*Epistula ad Serapionem de Morte Arii*
Nic.	*De Decretis Nicaeae Synodis*
Or. I C. Ar.	*Oratio I contra Arianos*
Or. II C. Ar.	*Oratio II contra Arianos*
Or. III C. Ar.	*Oratio III contra Arianos*
Syn.	*De Synodis*
Aug.	Augustine
Adim.	*Contra Adimantum*
C. Fel.	*Contra Felicem*
C. Fort.	*Contra Fortunatum*
Mor. Man.	*De Moribus . . . Manichaeorum*
Serm. Dom. Mont.	*De Sermone Domini in Monte*
Ut. Cred.	*De Utilitate Credendi*
Athen, Leg.	Athenagoras *Legatio*
Bas. Caes.	Basil of Caesarea
BSOAS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, London
Chrys.	Chrysostom
Comment in Isa.	*Commentaria in Isaiam*
De Melch.	*De Melchizedek*

Hom. 6 In Heb.	*Homilia in Hebraeos*
In Gen. Sermo	*In Genesim*
Clem. Alex.	Clement of Alexandria
Paedag.	*Paedagogus*
Strom.	*Stromateis*
Theod.	*Ex Theodoto*
CMC	Cologne Mani Codex
Const. Ap.	*Constitutiones Apostolorum*
Consularia Constantia	*Consularia Constantia*
Cyr. Cat.	Cyril of Jerusalem *Catechetical Lectures*
Cyr. Alex	Cyril of Alexandria
Glaph. in Gen.	*Glaphyra in Genesim*
Dial. Mont. Orth.	*Dialogus Montanistae cum Orthodoxo*
Didasc.	*Didascalia*
Did. Trin.	Didymus *De Trinitate*
Epiph.	Epiphanius
Ep.	Epistula
Ep. Barn.	*Epistle of Barnabas*
Eus.	Eusebius
Dem. Ev.	*Demonstratio Evangelica*
H. E.	*Historia Ecclesiastica*
Praep. Ev.	*Praeparatio Evangelica*
Vit. Const.	*Vita Constantini*
Filast. Haer.	Filastrius *Contra Omnes Haereses*
Gel.	Gelasius
Greg. Naz.	Gregory Nazianzus
Carm. Hist. I De Se Ipso	*Carmen Historica I de Se Ipso*
C. Eunom.	*Contra Eunomium*
Herm. Mand.	Hermas *Mandata*
Hipp.	Hippolytus
C. Noet.	*Contra Noetum*
Haer.	*Contra Omnes Haereses*
In Dan.	*Commentaria in Danielem*
Synt.	*Syntagma*
Hist. Aceph.	*Historia Acephala*
Hist. Laus.	*Historia Lausiaca*
HRII	F. W. K. Müller, *Handschriften-Reste in Estrangelo-Schrift aus Turfan*, Anhang APAW, 1904
Iren. Haer.	Irenaeus *Contra Omnes Haereses*
Jer.	Jerome

Adv. Jov.	*Adversus Jovinianum*
Chron.	*Chronicle*
Com. In Isa.	*Commentaria in Isaiam*
C. Rufin.	*Contra Rufinum*
In Tit.	*Commentaria in Titum*
Vir. Ill.	*De Viris Illustribus*
Jos.	Josephus
Ant.	*Antiquitates Judaicae*
C. Ap.	*Contra Apionem*
Jub.	*Book of Jubilees*
Jul. Af.	Julius Africanus
Keph.	*Kephalaia*
Lact. Div. Inst.	Lactantius *Divinae Institutiones*
Man. Hom.	*Manichaean Homilies*
Man. Ps.	*Manichaean Psalms*
Marc. Anc. Inc.	Marcellus of Ancyra *De Incarnatione*
MHG	Monumenta Historiae Germanica, Auctores Antiquissimi
MMH	F. C. Andres, W. Henning, *Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan*, APAW 1932, 1933, 1934
NGWG	*Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft zu Göttingen*
NHC	Nag Hammadi Corpus
Apoc. Adam	*Apocalypse of Adam*
Apoc. Jas.	*Apocryphon of James*
Apocry. John	*Apocryphon of John*
Gosp. Tr.	*Gospel of Truth*
Gr. Pow.	*Concept of Our Great Power*
Melch.	*Melchizedek*
Nat. Arch.	*Nature of the Archons*
Orig. Wld.	*Origin of the World*
Testim. Tr.	*Testimony of Truth*
Tri. Prot.	*Trimorphic Protennoia*
Nic. H. E.	Nicephorus *Historia Ecclesiastica*
Orig.	Origen
Cels.	*Contra Celsum*
Com. in Joh.	*Commentaria in Johannem*
Com. In Mat.	*Commentaria in Matthaeum*
Princ.	*De Principiis*
Pan.	Panarion

PG	Migne *Patrologia Graeca*
Philost.	Philostratus
PL	Migne *Patrologia Latina*
PS	*Pistis Sophia*
Ps.-Ath.	Pseudo-Athanasius
C. Apollin.	*Contra Apollinarem*
Haer.	*Contra Omnes Haereses*
PsT	Pseudo-Tertullian
Serap. Thm.	Serapion of Thmuis
Soc.	Socrates
Soz.	Sozomen *Historia Ecclesiastica*
SPAW	*Sitzungsberichte der Königlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Berlin
S-S	Stewart-Sykes
Tert.	Tertullian
Adv. Hermog.	*Adversus Hermogenem*
Adv. Marc.	*Adversus Marcionem*
Adv. Prax.	*Adversus Praxean*
Adv. Hermog.	*Adversus Hermogenem*
Adv. Jud.	*Adversus Judaeos*
Carn. Res.	*De Carnis Resurrectione*
Jejun.	*De Jejunia*
Monog.	*De Monogamia*
Pudic.	*De Pudicitia*
Virg. Vel.	*De Virginibus Velandis*
Theodoret Haer. Fab.	Theodoret *Haereticorum Fabulae*
Theophilus Ad. Autol.	Theophilus *Ad Autolycum*
Tit. Bost. Man.	Titus of Bostra *Adversus Manichaeos*
TPS	*Transactions of the Philosophical Society*, London
T	*Talmud Babli*
Trall.	Pseudo-Ignatius *Epistula ad Trallianos*
Vit. Epiph.	*Vita Epiphanii*

Sigla

<>	enclose a conjectural reading placed in the text by Holl
<*>	enclose a conjectural reading left in the apparatus by Holl
[ ]	enclose words supplied by the translator for clarity
( )	enclose parenthetical material in Epiphanius
(i. e.)	enclose translator's explanatory note

WORKS CITED

Achelis, Hans and Flemming, Johannes, *Die Syrische Didascalia übersetzt und erklärt*, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1904

Allberry, C. R. C., *A Manichaean Psalm Book*, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1938

Amidon, Philip R., *The Panarion of St. Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis: Selected Passages*, New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990

Asmussen, Jes P., *Manichaean Literature*, Delmar, N.Y.: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1975

Brightman, Frank Edward, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Volume I, Eastern, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965

Charlesworth, James S., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1983

Corssen, Peter, *Monarchianische Prologe zu den vier Evangelien*, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1896

Dechow, Jon, *Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity: Epiphanius of Cyprus and the Legacy of Origen*, Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1988

Dummer, Jürgen: "Die Epiphanius-Ausgabe der Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller," *Texte und Textkritik*, ed. Jürgen Dummer with Johannes Irmscher, Franz Paschalis, Kurt Treu, pp. 119–125

Drexl, Fr.: Review: Epiphanius, Ancoratus und Panarion, hrsg. Von Karl Holl 3 Bd.: Panarion Haer. 65–80. De Fide. [Die griech-christl Schriftst der ersten drei Jahrh., 37 Bd.] Leipzig: Hinrichs 1933

Field, Frederick, *Origenis Hexaplas quae Supersunt*, Holdesheim: G. Olms, 1964

Flügel, Gustav, *Mani Seine Lehre und seine Schriften: sein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Manichäismus aus dem Fihrist des Abu'l Farasch Muhammed ben Ishak al-Warrah*, Rep. Osnabruck: Biblio Verlag, 1969

Gardner, Lain, *The Kephalaia of the Teacher*, Leiden: Brill, 1995

Hahn, August, *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der alten Kirche*, Breslau: E. Morgenstern, 1897

Helm, August, *Die Chronik des Hieronymus*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1956

Hennecke, Edgar, *New Testament Apocrypha*, ed. Wilhelm Schneemelcher, trans. A. J. H. Higgins and others, London: Lutterworth Press, 1963

Holl, Karl, *Epiphanius II: Panarion haer. 34–64*, rev. ed. Jürgen Dummer, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1980

Holl, Karl, *Epiphanius III: haer. 65–80, De Fide*, rev. ed. Jürgen Dummer, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1985

Hörmann, Josef, "Gegen die Antidikomarianiten," *Des heiligen Epiphanius von Salamis ausgewählte Schriften*, Kempten und München: Verlag der Jos. Köselschen Buchhandlung, 1919, pp. 233–263

Klimkeit, Hans-J., *Gnosis on the Silk Road: Gnostic Parables, Hymns & Prayers from Central Asia*, San Francisco CA: Harper, 1993

Labriolle, Pierre, *Les Sources de l'Histoire du Montanisme*, repr. New York: A M S Press, 1980

Lietzmann, Hans, *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1904

Loofs, Friedrich, *Paulus von Samosata*, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1924

Pagels, Elaine, *Adam, Eve and the Serpent*, New York: Doubleday, 1988

Polotsky, Hans Jacob, *Manichâische Homilien*, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1934

Reichardt, Walther, *Die Briefe des Sextus Julius Africanus an Aristides und Origenes*, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1904

Riggi, C., "Nouvelle lecture du Panarion LIX (Épiphane et le divorce)," *Studia Patristica XII. Papers presented to the Sixth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford, 1971*, ed. E. A. Livingstone, Part I Berlin 1975 (TU 115) pp. 129–134

Routh, Martinus Josephus, *Reliquiae Sacrae*, Oxford: Oxford Press, 1846

Robertson, Archibald trans., "Ad Epictetum," *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, repr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978, IV pp. 570–574

Schmidt, Karl, *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung*, Hildesheim: Olms, 1967

Schwarz, Eduard, "Christliche und Jüdische Ostertafeln," APAW 1905

Stewart-Sykes, *The Didascalia Apostolorum: An English Version*, Turnhout: Brepols, 2009

Strobel, August, *Ursprung und Geschichte der frühchristlichen Osterkalendar*, Berlin: Academie Verlag, 1971

Wickham, L. R., "The Syntagmation of Aetius the Anomoean," JTS 19, 1968, pp. 532–569

Wolfsgruber, C., *Des heiligen Epiphanius von Salamis ausgewählte Schriften*, Kempten und München: Verlag der Jos. Köselschen Buchhandlung, 1880

ANACEPHALAEOSIS IV

Here likewise are the contents of this first Section of Volume Two; counted consecutively from the beginning of the sections it is Section Four. It contains eighteen Sects:

47. Encratites, who are an offshoot of Tatian, reject marriage and say that it is of Satan, and forbid the eating of any sort of meat.

48. Phrygians, also called Montanists and Tascodrugians. They accept the Old and the New Testaments but, by boasting of a Montanus and a Priscilla, introduce other prophets after the [canonical] prophets.

49. (1) Pepuzians, also called Quintillianists, with whom Artotyrites are associated. They derive from the Phrygians but teach different doctrines. They venerate Pepuza, a deserted city somewhere in Galatia, Cappadocia and Phrygia, and regard this as Jerusalem. (There is another Pepuza as well.) And they allow women to rule and to act as priests.

(2) Their initiation is the stabbing of a small child. And they tell the story that Christ was revealed in female form to Quintilla, or Priscilla, there in Pepuza.

(3) They likewise use the Old and the New Testaments, revising them to suit their own taste.

50. Quartodecimans, who celebrate the Passover on one day of the year, whichever day is the fourteenth of the month—whether on a Sabbath or a Lord's Day—and both fast and hold a vigil on that day.

51. Alogi, or so I have named them, who reject the Gospel of John and the eternal divine Word in it who has (come down) from on high, from the Father, and so accept neither John's Gospel itself, nor his Revelation.

52. (1) Adamians, by some called Adamizers, whose doctrine is not true but ridiculous. (2) For they assemble stark naked, men and women alike, and conduct their readings, prayers and everything else in that condition. This is because they are supposedly single and continent and, since they regard their church as Paradise, do not allow marriage.

53. Sampsaeans, also called Elkasaites, who live to this day in Arabia, the country lying north of the Dead Sea. They have been deceived by Elxai, a false prophet (2) whose descendants were Marthus and Marthana, two women who are still worshipped as goddesses by the sect. All their doctrines are quite like those of the Ebionites.

54. Theodotians, who derive from Theodotus the shoemaker, of Byzantium. He excelled in the Greek education, but when he was arrested with others during the persecution in his time, only he fell away. Because he was reproached after the martyrdom of the others, to escape the charge of denying God he thought of the expedient of calling Christ a mere man, and taught in this vein.

55. Melchizedekians, who honor Melchizedek and claim he is a power of some sort and not a mere man, and have dared to ascribe everything to his name and say as much.

56. Bardesians. Bardesianes came from Mesopotamia. At first he was a follower of the true faith and excelled in wisdom, but after he swerved from the truth he taught like Valentinus, except for a few small points < in > which he differs from Valentinus.

57. (1) Noetians. Noetus was from Smyrna in Asia. From conceit he taught, among other things, that Christ is the Son-Father,[1] < and said > that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are the same. (2) He also said that he was Moses; his brother, he said, was Aaron.

58. (1) Valesians. They live, I believe, in the chief village of Philadelphia in Arabia, Bacathus; they make eunuchs of all who happen by and accept their hospitality. Most of them are castrated eunuchs themselves. (2) They teach certain other things which are full of heresy, reject < the teachings > of the Law and the Prophets, and introduce certain other obscenities.

59. Purists (Cathari), who are connected with Navatus of Rome, entirely reject the twice-married, and do not accept repentance.

60. Angelics. These have entirely died out. Either they boasted of angelic rank, or they[2] were called Angelics < because they worshipped* > angels.

61. Apostolics, also called Apotactics. These too < live > in Pisidia; they accept only persons who renounce the world, and they pray by themselves. They are quite like the Encratites, but have opinions which are different from theirs.

62. Sabellians, whose opinions are like the Noetians' except that they deny that the Father has suffered.

63. Origenists, the disciples of one Origen. They are obscene, have unspeakable practices, and devote their bodies to corruption.

---

[1] υἱόσπατηρ.

[2] Holl: προσκυνεῖν <οὕτως ἐπεκλήθησαν>; MSS: προσκεκλῆσθαι.

64. Other Origenists, the disciples of the Origen who is called Adamantius the Author. They reject the resurrection of the dead, represent Christ and the Holy Spirit as creatures, allegorize Paradise, the heavens and all the rest, and foolishly say that Christ's kingdom will come to an end.

These, in turn, are the eighteen Sects of Volume Two, Section One.

Against Encratites.[1] *Number 47, but 67 of the series*

1,1 Certain persons whom we call Encratites are the successors of Tatian. They were led astray and deceived by Tatian in person, but have ideas different from his and in their own turn have devoted themselves to worse foolishness. (2) Even today their numbers are increasing in Pisidia and the land called Scorched Phrygia.[2] (Perhaps the country has come to be called this by divine dispensation, for this very reason—its inhabitants have been scorched by the perversity of such error, and so much of it. For there are many sects in the area.)

1,3 There are also Encratites in Asia, Isauria, Pamphylia, Cilicia and Galatia. And by now this sect < has > also < been planted > in Rome < to > an extent, and at Antioch in Syria as well—not everywhere, however.

1,4 Encratites too say that there are certain sovereign authorities,[3] and that the < power > of the devil is ranged against God's creatures[4] because the devil is not subject to God; he has power of his own and acts as in his own right, and not as though he had fallen into perversity.[5] For they do not agree with the church, but differ from its declaration of the truth.

1,5 As scriptures they use principally the so-called Acts of Andrew, and of John, and of Thomas, and certain apocrypha,[6] and any sayings from the Old Testament that they care to.

---

[1] Epiphanius may have used Iren. Haer. 1.28.1, but clearly has contemporary knowledge of the Encratites. Other ancient discussions are found at Hippol. Haer. 8.7; Eus. H. E. 4.28–30; Clem. Alex. Paedag. 2.2.33; Strom. 1.91.5; 3.76.25; 7.108.2. The apocryphal Acts of John, Andrew and Thomas afford many instances of the sort of teachings described here.

[2] Basil of Caesarea Ep. 188; 198; 236.

[3] ἄρχαι. Typically Gnostic terms for such beings are found at Acts of John 94; 95; 98–99; Acts of Andrew 20; Acts of Thomas 27; 50; 121; 132; 133; 148.

[4] "Let rulers be broken, let powers fall" is said of Satan's host at Acts of John 114.

[5] The apocryphal Acts represent the devil as a powerful, dangerous being at Acts of Andrew 27; Acts of Thomas 31; 32; 34; 44; 76. At Acts of Thomas 31 the devil says, "The Son of God hath wronged me against my will, and taken them that were his own from me."

[6] The Nag Hammadi tractate, Thomas the Contender (NHC II, 7) contains a sharp polemic against sexual intercourse, but there is no evidence that the "Encratites," as described here, used it.

1,6 They declare that marriage is plainly the work of the devil[7] And they regard meat as an abomination—though they do not prohibit it for the sake of continence or as a pious practice, but from fear and for appearance' sake, and in order not to be condemned for eating flesh.[8]

1,7 Encratites too celebrate mysteries with water.[9] They do not drink wine at all,[10] and claim that it is of the devil, and that those who drink and use it are malefactors and sinners. (8) And yet they believe in the resurrection of the dead—which goes to show that, for people who have gone this far wrong, everything is crazy. (9) Indeed, a person with sense can see, and wonder, and find himself nonplussed about everything the heretics say and do, because none of their speech and behavior hangs together and admits of any appearance of truth.

2,1 For if they use the Old and New Testaments, where are there any different authorities? The two Testaments are in agreement about one < authority > and proclaim the knowledge of < one Godhead >. (2) And if there is a resurrection of the dead too, how can lawful wedlock be of the devil? For God says, "Be fruitful and multiply;"[11] and the Lord says, in the Gospel, "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."[12] And the apostle says, "Marriage is honorable, and the bed undefiled."[13]

2,3 But when they are confronted with such arguments they malign Paul by calling him a drunkard.[14] And they seize on certain texts against wine drinkers which they go hunting for to suit their taste and support their fiction, and say that anything like wine is of the devil. "Noah drank wine," they say, "and was stripped naked. (4) Lot got drunk, and unknowingly lay with his own daughters. The calf was made during a drinking bout. And the scripture says, 'Who hath confusion? Who hath contentions? Who hath resentments and gossip? Who hath afflictions without

---

[7] Marriage is called "the work of the serpent" at Acts of Thomas 57. Condemnations of matrimony are found in the apocryphal Acts, e.g. at Acts of John 63; 113; Acts of Andrew 28; 35; Acts of Thomas 12–16; 96–103; 131. Cf. Iren. Haer. 1.28.1; Hippol. Haer. 8.20.15; Clem. Alex. Strom. 1.71.5; 2.46.3.

[8] Iren Haer. 1.28.1; Hippol. Haer. 8.20.1; Basil of Caesarea Ep. 236,4.

[9] Acts of Thomas 121. Cyprian of Carthage Ep. 63 is a tract against the practice, which suggests that it sometimes occurred in catholic circles.

[10] Hippol. Haer. 8.20.10; Clem. Alex. Paedag. 2.32.1–3; Basil of Caesarea Ep. 236,4.

[11] Gen 1:28.

[12] Matt 19:6; Mark 10:9.

[13] Heb 13:4.

[14] In his Prologue to the Epistle to Titus, Jerome says that "Tatian, the patriarch of the Encratites" repudiated several of the Pauline Epistles.

cause? Whose eyes are inflamed? Is it not they that tarry long at wine, that seek out the place where drinking is?' "[15]

2,5 And they track down other texts of this kind and make a collection of them for the sake of their own credibility, without realizing that all immoderation is in every way grievous, and declared to be outside of the prescribed bounds. (6) For I would say this not merely of wine, but of every form of intemperance. The Lord was teaching this lesson when he said, "Let not your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness and cares of this life."[16] So was the text, "If thou be given to appetite, be not desirous of a rich man's meats, for these attend on a life of deceit."[17] (7) And further, when the holy apostle was ridding the church of the intemperate and greedy he said, in anger at their gluttonous desires, "Meats for the belly, and the belly for meats; but God shall destroy both it and them."[18]

2,8 Besides, Esau lost his birthright over a wheat mash—as the scripture says, calling the same thing a "wheat mash" and a "lentil mash."[19] (I imagine it was not made of wheat—that is, not made of grain. I think the scripture was probably describing the leftover lentils—which had already been boiled, and which had been put back on the fire and heated up again—as "< boiled > on the fire," because they had been heated up after cooling off. (9) And as Noah was stripped naked after using wine but without coming to any harm, so Esau came to the harm of losing his birthright, but from hunger and greed rather than from wine. And no falsely applied text is of any avail when set beside the truth, nor is any invention of dramatic fiction.

3,1 They pride themselves on supposed continence, but all their conduct is risky. For they are surrounded by women, deceive women in every way, travel and eat with women and are served by them. For they are outside of the truth, "having the form of godliness, but denying the power thereof."[20] (2) For if a person neglects any part of a work such as this, through the one part which he neglects he has given up the whole of it. And so it is that their mysteries are celebrated only with water, and are

---

[15] Prov 23:29–30.
[16] Luke 21:34.
[17] Prov 23:3.
[18] 1 Cor 6:13.
[19] Cf. LXX, confusing Gen 25:30 with 25:34. Epiphanius here takes πυρός, "wheat," as the genitive of πῦρ, "fire."
[20] 2 Tim 3:5.

not mysteries but false mysteries, celebrated in imitation of the true ones. (3) Hence the Encratites will be defeated on this point too, by the plain words of the Savior, "I will not drink henceforth of this *fruit of the vine*, until I drink it new with you in the kingdom of God."[21]

3,4 Disabling this sect in its turn with the mighty hand of the truth—like a stinging insect deprived of teeth—let us go on to the rest, calling on the God of all, as we always do, to be our guide and our defender against horrors, and to be the help of our judgment as he is the giver of our wisdom. May I thus learn the truth from him and be able to expose the < nonsense* > of the others and, by the speech of the truth, make the medicinal antidote for them from many fragrant herbs. May it be given ungrudgingly: for healing, to those who have already contracted [the disease]; as a treatment, to whose who are coming down with it; as a preventative, to those who are about to learn something they did not know; and to myself, for God's salvation and reward.

Against those who are called Phrygians or Montanists[1] *or, also, Tascodrugians. Number 28, but 48 of the series*

1,1 Out of these in turn there emerges another sect, called the sect of the Phrygians. It originated at the same time as the Encratites, and is their successor. (2) For the Montanists had their beginning about the nineteenth year of Hadrian's successor Antoninus Pius,[2] while Marcion, Tatian, and the Encratites who succeeded him had theirs in Hadrian's time and after Hadrian.

1,3 These Phrygians too, as we call them, accept every scripture of the Old and the New Testaments and likewise affirm the resurrection of the dead. But they boast of having one Montanus as a prophet, and Priscilla and Maximilla as prophetesses, and by paying heed to them have lost their wits. (4) They agree with the holy catholic church about the Father,

---

[21] Matt 26:29.

[1] An important source for this sect is a well informed and early catholic refutation; see Labriolle pp. L–LI. Other significant descriptions of the Montanists are found at Hipp. Haer. 8.19; 10.25–28; Eus. H. E. 5.14–19; Jer. Ep. 41; PsT 47; Filast. Haer. 49; Cyr. Cat. 16.18; Did. De Trin. 3.41, and the Montanist works of Tertullian. And see Labriolle's entire collection. Since Filast. 49 closely resembles Epiphanius while PsT is quite different from both, it is uncertain whether Epiphanius has made use of Hippol. Synt. here, or whether Filast. depends upon Epiphanius.

[2] I.e., 157 c. e. See Clem Alex. Strom. 3.106.4–5.

the Son and the Holy Spirit,[3] but have separated themselves by "giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils"[4] and saying, "We must receive the gifts of grace as well."

1.5 God's holy church also receives the gifts of grace—but the real gifts, which have already been tried in God's holy church through the Holy Spirit, and by prophets and apostles, and the Lord himself. (6) For the apostle John says in his Epistle, "Try the spirits, whether they be of God;"[5] and again, "Ye have heard that Antichrist cometh, and now many Antichrists have come. They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us: but that it might be made known that they were not of us. For this cause write I unto you, little children,"[6] and so on. (7) The Phrygians are truly not "of" the saints themselves. They "went out" by their contentiousness, and "gave heed" to spirits of error and fictitious stories.

2,1 For see here, by their thesis itself they are convicted of inability to keep their contentious promises. If we must receive gifts of grace, and if there must be gifts of grace in the church, why do they have no more prophets after Montanus, Priscilla and Maximilla?[7] Has grace stopped operating, then? Never fear, the grace in the holy church does not stop working! (2) But if the prophets prophesied up until a certain point, and no more < after that* >, then neither Priscilla nor Maximilla prophesied; < they delivered their prophecies after > the ones which were tried by the holy apostles, in the holy church.

2,3 Their stupidity will be refuted in two ways, then. Either they should show that there are prophets after Maximilla, so that their so-called "grace" will not be inoperative. Or Maximilla and her like will be proved false prophets, since they dared to receive inspiration after the end of the prophetic gifts—not from the Holy Spirit but from devils' imposture—and delude her audience.

---

[3] Dial. Mont. Orth. The Montanist Tertullian detests monarchianism (Adv. Prax. 1.1–3; 5) and attributes his essentially catholic doctrine of the Trinity to the Paraclete (Adv. Prax. 2.1; 8.5). Montanists are, however, accused of monarchianism in the Dial. Mont. Orth. (Labriolle pp. 92–98) and at Jer. Ep. 41.3; cf. Orig. Cels. 8.9; Hippol. Haer. 8.19.3. PsT 7.2 and Did. Trin. 3.41.1 distinguish between Montanists who are monarchian and those who are not.

[4] 1 Tim 4:1. For the use of this text against Montanists cf. Hippol. In Dan. 3.20; Orig. Comm. In Matt 15.30.

[5] 1 John 4:1.

[6] Cf. 1 John 2:18–19.

[7] So argued at Eus. H. E. 5.17.4 (anonymous anti-Montanist).

2,4 And see how they can be refuted from the very things they say! Their so-called prophetess, Maximilla, says, "After me there will be no prophet more, but the consummation." (5) See here, the Holy Spirit and the spirits of error are perfectly recognizable! Everything the prophets have said, they also said rationally and with understanding; and the things they said have come true and are still coming true. (6) But Maximilla said that the consummation would come after her, and no consummation has come yet—even after so many emperors, and such a lapse of time! (7) There have been about 206[8] years from Maximilla's time until ours, the twelfth year of Valentinian and Valens and the < eighth > of Gratian,[9] and we have yet to see the consummation which was announced by this woman who boasted of being a prophetess, but did not even know the day of her own death.

2,8 And it is plain to see that none who have estranged themselves from the truth have retained any soundness of reason. Like babes bitten by the perennial deceiver, the serpent, they have surrendered themselves to destruction and to being caught outside the fold and dragged off to be the wolf's meat < and > thus perish. This is because they did not hold on to the Head but deserted the truth and hazarded themselves in shipwreck, and in the surf of all sorts of error. (9) If Maximilla says there will never be another prophet, she is denying that they have the gift, and that it is still to be found among them. If their gift persists [only] until Maximilla, then, as I said before, she had no portion of the gifts either.[10]

3,1 For she has gone astray. The Lord has set his seal on the church, and perfected the gifts of grace < in > her. When prophets were needed the same saints, filled with the Holy Spirit, delivered all the prophecies for our benefit[11]—[delivered them] in the true Spirit, with sound mind and rational intellect, in proportion to their < faith > in the gifts of grace the Spirit was giving to each, and "in proportion to the faith."[12] (2) But what have these people said that was beneficial? What have they said that was in proportion to the faith? Indeed, how can they be any but the persons of whom the Lord said, "Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves?"[13]

---

[8] Holl: σς; MSS: διακοσία ἐνενήκοντα.
[9] 376 C. E. Epiph has been at work on the Panarion for about a year; cf. Proem 11.2.
[10] So argued at Eus. H. E. 5.17.4 (anonymous anti-Montanist).
[11] Cf. 1 Cor 12:7.
[12] Cf. Rom 12:6.
[13] Matt 7:15.

3,3 By comparing what they have said with < the teachings > of the Old and New Testaments—which are true, and which have been delivered and prophesied in truth—let us determine which is < really > prophecy, and which false prophecy. (4) A prophet always spoke with composure and understanding, and delivered his oracles by the Holy Spirit's inspiration.[14] He said everything with a sound mind like "Moses, the servant of God and faithful in all his house, who saw the glory of God < apparently, and not in dark speeches."[15] And thus the man who *saw** > was called a prophet in the Old Testament. (5) Scripture says, "The vision which Isaiah the son of Amoz, the prophet, *saw*:[16] *I saw* < the > Lord sitting upon a throne high and lifted up. And I *saw* Seraphim and Cherubim, and I heard the Lord saying unto me, Go and tell this people, Hear indeed and ye shall not understand; and see indeed, and ye shall not perceive."[17] And after hearing this from the Lord he went to the people and said, "Thus saith the Lord." (6) Can't you see that this is the speech of a sober person who is not out of his senses, and that the words were not delivered as the speech of a mind distraught?

3,7 Similarly, when the prophet Ezekiel heard the Lord say, "Bake thee bread on human dung,"[18] he said, "Not so, Lord; nothing common or unclean hath at any time come into my mouth."[19] (8) Understanding that which had been threateningly said to him by the Lord, he did not go ahead and do [it] as though he were out of his senses. Since his mind was sound and rational he prayed and said, "Not so, Lord." These—both the teaching and the discussion—are marks of < the > true prophets, whose minds are sound in the Holy Spirit.

3,9 And who can deny that Daniel was filled with all wisdom and in possession of his senses? He found the answers to Nebuchadnezzar's riddles, (10) recalled Nebuchadnezzar's dreams when they had eluded even the dreamer, and with his soundness of mind and the superiority of his gift, gave the explanation at once. For he had wisdom greater than everyone's by the gift of the Holy Spirit, who truly gives wisdom—to the

---

[14] Eus. H. E. 5.17.2–3 (anonymous anti-Montanist): But the false prophet prophesies in ecstasy . . . They cannot show that any of the truly inspired prophets in the Old or the New Testament was of this sort. . .

[15] Num 12:7–8.

[16] Isa 1:1.

[17] Cf. Isa 6:1–3; 9.

[18] Ezek 4:12.

[19] Ezek 4:14.

prophet and to those who, through the prophet, are vouchsafed the teaching of the truth.

3,11 But when the Phrygians profess to prophesy, it is plain that they are not sound of mind and rational. Their words are ambiguous and odd, with nothing right about them. (4,1) Montanus, for instance, says, "Lo, the man is as a lyre, and I fly over him as a pick. The man sleepeth, while I watch. Lo, it is the Lord that distracteth the hearts of men, and that giveth the heart to man."[20]

4,2 Now what rational person who receives the "profitable" message with understanding and cares for his salvation, can fail to despise a false religion like this, and the speech of someone who boasts of being a prophet but cannot talk like a prophet? (3) For the Holy Spirit never spoke in him. Such expressions as "I fly," and "strike," and "watch," and "The Lord distracteth men's hearts," are the utterances of an ecstatic. They are not the words of a rational man, but of someone of a different stamp from the Holy Spirit who spoke in the prophets.

4,4 When the Phrygians are undertaking to combine falsehood with truth and rob of their intelligence persons who care for accuracy, they pile up[21] texts to make a false case for their imposture, and < to prove their lies from them* >, say that certain scriptures bear a resemblance to it. < For instance >, the holy scripture has said, "God sent an 'ecstasy' upon Adam, and he slept."[22]

But Adam's case was nothing like theirs. (5) In their case God did not mean to fashion a body—his reason for putting Adam into a trance—and, of his extreme lovingkindness, give them a similar experience. (6) God brought the unconsciousness of sleep upon Adam, not distraction of mind.

There are many different forms of ecstasy. We call stupefaction from excess of wonder an ecstasy; and madness is called ecstasy because it is *out* of touch with reality. (7) But Adam's "ecstasy" of sleep was so called in a different sense, one related to the activity of his body, especially because the holy Adam whom God's hand had fashioned was cast into a very deep trance.

---

[20] Tertullian maintains that a prophet loses his senses because he is overshadowed by the power of God, and cannot know what he has said, Adv. Marc. 4.22.4–5. At Adv. Marc. 4.22.1; 5.8.12 he equates ecstasy with *amentia*.

[21] Reading ἐπισωρεύουσι <τε> λόγους with the omission of the τε.

[22] LXX Gen 2:21. Tertullian, who regards dreams as a kind of madness, explains Adam's "ecstasy" similarly at De Anima 45.1–6; 23.

5,1 For it is indeed plain that the sacred scripture was right to call this ecstasy. When someone is asleep, all his senses leave him and take a rest. Though the sense of sight is there, for example, it does not see; the eye is closed, and the mover in the man, the spirit or soul, is at rest. (2) If there is an unpleasant odor in the house or even a pleasant one, the sense of smell is there but does not perceive the odor; this sense has gone off to take a rest. (3) If there are bitter, or salty or sweet fluids in the mouth, the sense of taste does not perceive them; it lies in the ecstasy of rest without doing what it did in the man when he was awake.

5,4 The ear is there, but the hearing is not functioning as a sense. And if people are talking in the house it often does not hear what anyone says unless the man wakes up; for the time being, its function is suspended. (5) Creatures can be crawling on our bodies, but we do not feel their touch on our bodies unless their onslaught is severe; the whole body has abandoned its activity for the rest of sleep.

5,6 For the body is made of earth and envelops the soul, and since God made it serviceable to us in this way, it is allowed a time of withdrawal from its full sensation to a state of rest. The soul itself does not abandon its function of governance or thought. (7) It often imagines and sees itself as though it were awake, and walks around, does work, crosses the sea, addresses crowds—and sees itself in more situations, and more striking ones, in its dreams.[23] (8) But it is not like a madman, or an ecstatic in a transport. He takes frightful things in hand while awake in body and soul, and often does grievous harm to himself and his neighbors. He does not know what he is saying and doing, for he has fallen into the ecstasy of folly.

6,1 Beloved, I have needed to gather all this material < about > the various kinds of ecstasy because of the text, "The Lord sent an ecstasy upon Adam, and he slept."[24] (2) And I have explained why going to sleep is called an "ecstasy from the Lord" in that passage. It is because of the compassion and lovingkindess God has granted to all, so that one may be removed from care and the business of living to the rest of sleep. (3) In Adam's case, however, God further called it ecstasy because it made him insensitive to pain for a time, because of the side God meant to take from him and make into his wife.

---

[23] Cf. Tertullian's description of dreams at De Anima 45; dreams, while a form of madness, are healthy and natural.

[24] Gen 2:21.

6,4 But Adam's senses and wits were not in abeyance. He recognized Eve as soon as he awoke, and said, "This is now bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called 'wife,' for she was taken out of her husband."[25] (5) And as you see, he was aware of the past and the present, and made a prophecy of the future. Look here, by saying "bone of my bone" he took notice of what had happened while he was asleep. And he was aware of the present; after his wife had been made he was aware that she had been taken from < his > body. (6) And of the future he prophesied, "For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother and shall cleave unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh."[26] These are not the words of a man in an ecstasy or without understanding, but of a person of sound mind.

7,1 But if I also have to speak of "I said in my ecstasy, all men are liars,"[27] the meaning of this, again, is different. These are not the words of a madman and an ecstatic < as the Phrygians claim* >—far from it!—(2) but of someone who is very surprised, and is taking more notice than usual < of > things that are < not > fit to be said and done. For since the prophet was astonished, he also speaks with astonishment here.

7,3 The prophets fell into trances, < but* > not into distraction. Peter too was in an "ecstasy,"[28] not because he was irrational but because he saw things other than what men usually see in the everyday world. (4) "For he saw a sheet let down, bound at the four corners, and in it all manner of four-footed beasts and creeping things and birds of the air."[29] (5) Observe that St. Peter was rational, and not out of his mind. For when he heard < the words >, "Arise, kill and eat,"[30] he did not obey like a person of unsound mind, but told the Lord, "Not so, Lord; nothing common or unclean hath at any time come into my mouth."[31]

7,6 And the holy David said, "< I said >, all men are liars."[32] In saying, "I said," he was speaking for himself, and saying that people lie. Thus he was not lying—but he expressed great astonishment because he was amazed

---

[25] Gen 2:23.
[26] Gen 2:24.
[27] Ps 115:2.
[28] Didymus at Comm. In Acts 10:10 (Labriolle p. 162). Tertullian insists at C. Marc. 4.22.4–5 that Peter's recognition of Moses and Elijah could have taken place only in a state of ecstasy.
[29] Acts 10:11–12.
[30] Acts 10:13.
[31] Cf. Acts 10:14.
[32] Ps 115:2.

and astounded at God's lovingkindness and the things the Lord had told him. (7) And, seeing that everyone is in need of God's mercy, he ascribed truth-telling to the Lord alone, and realized that every human being is deserving of punishment—thus evidencing the true Spirit, who spoke in the prophets and revealed to them the depths of the exact knowledge of God.

7,8 Abraham too fell into ecstasy—not the abeyance of his wits but the distraction of fear. He saw the furnace and the torches about sundown < and was afraid, as* > other prophets said when they saw visions in their right minds. (9) Moses, for example, said, "I fear exceedingly and quake."[33] But Abraham knew what the Lord was saying, for < scripture says >, "Thou shalt *know* of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger 400 years in a land that is not theirs."[34] (10) And you see how plain it is that everything was said in truth by the prophets with sound mind and sober reason, and not in madness.

8,1 But even though they choose to reply, "The former gifts are not like the latter,"[35] how can they prove it? The holy prophets and the holy apostles prophesied alike. (2) In the first place, those who saw the two men in white when the Savior ascended into heaven did not see them in derangement, but with sound minds heard [them say], "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up unto heaven? This same Jesus, who is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come,"[36] and so on. (3) And then, as I said, Peter was in his right mind when he saw, heard, and gave his answer, and said, "Not so, Lord."[37]

8,4 Agabus spoke prophetically and hinted at his meaning with an unusual gesture, when he took Paul's girdle, bound his own feet, and said, "He whose girdle this is, him shall they bind and carry to Jerusalem."[38] (5) And in turn, prophets came down to Antioch and declared that there would be a world-wide famine, and their prediction did not fail; to show that they were true prophets, the scripture adds at once, "Which thing came to pass in the days of Claudius Caesar."[39]

---

[33] Deut 9:19; Heb 12:21.
[34] Gen 15:13.
[35] Tertullian says that the Paraclete's instructions are novelties of discipline but not of doctrine, Monog. 3.8; 9; Virg. Vel. 1.2–4.
[36] Acts 1:11.
[37] Acts 10:14.
[38] Acts 21:11.
[39] Acts 21:11.

8,6 And the most holy apostle Paul prophesied, "Now the Spirit saith expressly that in the last days harsh times shall come,"[40] and so on. (7) And again, in another place, "Some shall fall away from sound doctrine, giving heed to seducing < spirits > and doctrines of devils, forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be partaken of by us < who receive them > with thanksgiving."[41] (8) The material before this < will > itself < make it plain > that < this > has clearly come true, in you and in others like you. Most of these sects forbid marriage and enjoin abstinence from foods, though they do not do this for discipline's sake or for greater virtue with its rewards and crowns, but because they regard these creatures of the Lord as abominations.

9,1 Now the holy catholic church reveres virginity, monogamy and purity, commends widowhood, and honors and accepts lawful wedlock; but it forbids fornication, adultery and unchastity. (2) This will show the character of the holy catholic church and the false customs of the others—[show], < likewise >, who has seen fit to avoid every imposture, crooked path and uphill track. (3) For I have said before—as has just been said by the most holy apostle and I shall now repeat—that it was to make us secure and distinguish the character of the holy catholic church from the imposture of the sects, that Paul said how arrogantly the sects which forbid matrimony and prescribe abstinence from foods prohibit God's good ordinances by law.

9,4 For it was < with > a certain fitness that the divine Word said, "Wilt thou be perfect?"[42] in the Gospel. Although he makes allowances for human clay and its frailty, he rejoices in those who can show the marks of piety and choose to practice virginity, purity and continence. Still, he honors marriage to one spouse, (5) even though he prefigures the gifts of the priesthood chiefly by means of persons who stayed continent after one marriage, and persons who remained virgin, and his holy apostles so established the canonical rule of the priesthood, with decency and holiness.[43] (6) But if, from frailty, someone needs to contract a second marriage after the death of his wife, the rule of the truth does not prohibit this—that is, provided he is not a priest.

---

[40] 2 Tim 3:1.
[41] 1 Tim 4:1; 3.
[42] Matt 10:21.
[43] Didasc. 4, A-F p. 14.

But these people do forbid it—"forbidding to marry,"[44] as scripture says. They expel anyone who has contracted a second marriage, and make their rule against second marriage a matter of compulsion.

For our part, we lay necessity on no one. As a good counsel we urge those who can [to follow this rule], but we lay no necessity on one who cannot, and surely do not expel him from life.[45] (9) The holy word everywhere declared that we must bear with the frailty of the weak. We shall find at once that, to shame people like these < who expel persons* > who do not have the same gift as they, the holy apostle says, "Younger widows refuse; (10) for after they wax wanton against Christ they will marry, having condemnation because they have left their first faith."[46] For widows who have promised and broken their promise have condemnation, while those who made no promise, but married from frailty, will not have condemnation. If they were to have condemnation, why did Paul say, "Let them marry, guide the house."[47]

10,1 We find then that every prophet, whether in the Old Testament or in the New, prophesies with understanding, as St. John said in Revelation: "The Lord *revealed* these things to his servants through his servant John,"[48] and, "Thus saith the Lord." (2) The person who said this was sound of mind and understanding—see how < he says the same as the Old Testament prophets who say* >, "Thus saith the Lord," and "the vision which he saw."

10,3 But this Montanus, who has deceived his victims with his boast of being a prophet, describes things which are not consistent with sacred scripture. For in his so-called prophecy he says, "Why sayest thou, [Only] he that is more than man can be saved?[49] For the righteous shall shine an hundredfold brighter than the sun; and the least of you that are saved, an hundredfold brighter than the moon."

10,4 But the Lord confounds him. And it is he who has the power to grant radiance to the faces of the saints, who made Moses' face shine, and who will transform his saints, who are sown in dishonor and raised in

---

[44] 1 Tim 4:3. This discipline was crucial to Montanists, cf. Tert. Pudic. 1.20; Adv. Marc. 1.29.4; Carn. Res. 8.4; Monog., especially 1.2; 14.3. Cf. Jer. Ep. 41.3.1.

[45] Montanists regarded second marriages as adultery (Tert. Monog. 15.1; Adv. Hermog. 1.2) and excommunicated those who contracted them (Jer. Ep. 41.3.1).

[46] 1 Tim 5:11–12. Tertullian takes this passage to mean that the church should not receive younger widows as converts, Monog. 13.1.

[47] 1 Tim 5:14.

[48] Cf. Rev 1:1.

[49] A reference to the rigor of second century penitential discipline?

glory, at the coming resurrection of bodies. (5) Not transform bodies other than their own but change their own bodies, raised entire, and receiving glory, after < the resurrection >, from him who gives glory unstintingly to his saints. For as Lord and God he has the power to grant and bestow glory.

10,6 But although he has < the power > to grant this, he did not make promises like Montanus'; he said, "Your faces shall shine as the sun."[50] Now if Jesus Christ, who has the power and is our true Master and Lord, says that the faces of the righteous will shine *as* the sun, how can Montanus promise a hundred times more? (7) Only if he is like the one who promised Adam, "Ye shall be as gods,"[51] and secured his expulsion from the glory he had and the enjoyment of Paradise, and his degradation to the corruption of death.

11,1 This same Montanus goes on to add, "I am the Lord God, the Almighty, dwelling in a man." (2) Happily the sacred scripture, and the course of the Holy Spirit's teaching, keeps us safe by giving us warnings so that we will know which are the counterfeits of the strange spirit and the opposites of the truth. (3) Simply by saying this, Montanus has suggested that we remember the words of the Lord. For the Lord says in the Gospel, "I came in my Father's name and ye received me not. Another shall come in his own name, and such a one will ye receive."[52] (4) Montanus is thus in total disagreement with the sacred scriptures, as any attentive reader can see. And since he is in disagreement, < he himself >, and the sect which like him boasts of having prophets and gifts, are strangers to the holy catholic church. He did not receive these gifts; he departed from them.

11,5 What rational person would dare to call these people prophets instead of < saying > that such prophets are deceivers? Christ taught us, "I send unto you the Spirit, the Paraclete,"[53] and to give the signs of the Paraclete, said, "He shall glorify me."[54] (6) And in fact it is plain that the holy apostles glorified the Lord after receiving the Paraclete Spirit, while this Montanus glorifies himself. The Lord glorified his Father; and in turn, the Lord Christ glorified the Spirit by calling him the Spirit of truth.

---

[50] Cf. Matt 13:43.
[51] Gen 3:5.
[52] John 5:43.
[53] Cf. John 16:7.
[54] John 16:4.

Montanus, however, glorifies only himself, and says that he is the Father almighty, and that < the deceitful spirit* > which dwells in him < is the Paraclete* >—proof positive that he is not the Father, was not sent by the Father, and has received nothing from the Father. (7) "In the Lord was all the fullness of the Godhead pleased to dwell bodily,"[55] and "Of his fullness have all the prophets received,"[56] as St. John has told us. (8) And see how all the ancient [prophets] announced Christ, and how those who came after them glorified Christ and confessed him. But Montanus intruded himself by saying that he was somebody, proof that he is not Christ, was not sent by Christ, and has received nothing from Christ.

11,9 This pathetic little nobody, Montanus, says in turn, "Neither angel nor messenger, but I the Lord, God the Father, have come."[57] In so saying he will be exposed as a heretic, for he is not glorifying Christ, whom every regular gift which has been given in the holy church truly glorified. (10) For we shall find that Montanus is outside the body of the church and the Head of all, and "does not hold the Head, from whom the whole body, knit together, increaseth,"[58] as scripture says. For the actual true Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, showed that he was a Son; but Montanus even says that he is the Father.

12,1 When you Phrygians say you left the church over gifts of grace[59] how can we believe you? Even though you are disguised with the title of "Christian," you have launched another enemy attack on us. You have taken up the barbarians' quarrel and mimicked the enmity of the Trojans, who were also Phrygians! (2) Things that are different from gifts and—as your own prophets say—not the same kind that the Lord promises, cannot be gifts.

12,3 And in turn, you introduce us to—Maximilla! Even your names are different and scary, with nothing pleasant and melodious about them, but with a certain wildness and savagery. (4) At once this Maximilla, who belongs to these so-called Phrygians—listen to what she says, children of Christ! "Hearken not unto me, but hearken unto Christ![60]

---

[55] Col 2:9.
[56] Cf. John 1:16.
[57] Cf. Isa 63:9. At Adv. Marc. 4.22.11 Tertullian applies this saying to Christ himself.
[58] Col 2:19.
[59] Tert. Adv. Prax. 1.7, "*et nos quidem postea agnitio paraclyti atque defensio disjunxit a psychicis*."
[60] Cf. Luke 10:16.

12,5 Even where she seemed to be glorifying Christ, she was wrong. If she were Christ's she would talk like the holy apostles, as each < of them > says—Peter first, who says, "We have heard of him."[61] And the Lord himself says, "He that heareth you, heareth me."[62] And Paul says, "Be ye imitators of me, as I am of Christ."[63]

12,6 But in the act of lying she is telling the truth, even against her will. She is right to say not to listen to her, but to Christ. Unclean spirits are often forced to denounce themselves < as > not of the truth and to show, willy nilly and under duress, who their Lord is.[64] (7) As the damsel with the oracular spirit said, "These men are servants of the most high God";[65] and [as the demon in the Gospel said], "Why hast thou come before the time to torment us? I know thee who thou art, the holy one of God."[66] So Maximilla, under compulsion, said not to listen to her, but to Christ. (8) Now how can those who have heard this from her and believed her care to listen to her—when they have learned from her not to listen to her, but to the Lord! In fact if they had any sense they shouldn't listen to her, since her oracles are of the earth.

12,9 And don't tell me that she was in a rational state! A rational person doesn't condemn himself in his own teaching. If she said anything like, "Don't listen to me," what sort of spirit was speaking in her? (10) For if she spoke humanly, then she was not in the Holy Spirit—for it is plain that in saying, "Do not listen to me," she was speaking humanly, and was not in the Holy Spirit. But if she was not in the Holy Spirit from on high but was thinking humanly, she knew nothing and was no prophetess. For she did not have the Holy Spirit, but spoke and delivered her oracles with human intelligence.

12,11 But if she did speak and prophesy in the Holy Spirit—what sort of Holy Spirit would say, "Don't listen to me?" The blindness of deceit is stone blind—and great is the word of God, which gives us understanding in every way, so that we may know what has been spoken by the Holy Spirit's inspiration, here in the person of the Father, there in the person of the Son, there in the person of the Holy Spirit!

---

61 Cf. Acts 4:20; 2 Pet 1:18.
62 Luke 10:16.
63 1 Cor 11:1.
64 Catholic exorcists exorcise Montanist prophets at Eus. H. E. 5.16.7–8 (Apollinarius); 18.13 (Apollonius); 19.3 (Serapion); Firmilian/Cyprian Ep. 45.10.
65 Acts 16:16–17.
66 Matt 8:29; Mark 1:24.

12,12 And if the spirit in Maximilla were a holy < spirit >, it would not forbid its own utterances. "*One* is the Holy Spirit, that divideth to each as he will."[67] (13) And if he has the power to divide as he will, and is called the Spirit of knowledge and the Spirit of piety, and is said to be the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ, proceeding from the Father and receiving of the Son and not foreign to the Father and the Son—then he didn't say, "Do not listen to me!" (14) For the Spirit gave Christ's message and Christ sends the Spirit, and casts out devils by the Holy Spirit. And the Son gives the Father's message and the Father sanctified the Son and sent him into the world, that they might know him, and might glorify him as they glorify the Father. And the notion of those who separate themselves from the following of Christ is all wrong.

13,1 In turn the same Maximilla—this "rational knowledge and teaching," if I may be sarcastic—says, "The Lord hath sent me perforce, willing and not willing, to be votary, herald and interpreter of this burden and covenant and promise, to impart the knowledge of God."[68] (2) Let us look to the firm foundation of our life, beloved, and the lighted pathway, and not trip on words of the adversary and the prey of the strange spirit. (3) See the prophet here, who spoke like that and denounced herself, not willingly but under compulsion. Our Lord did not come into the world unwillingly, and was not sent under compulsion by the Father. (4) He has the will in concert with the Father, and the performance of it in concert with the Holy Spirit. And as he himself has the will—and the giving of grace to all, not perforce but by his superabundant lovingkindness—in concert with the Father, even so, those whom he has called, he has called of their own choice, imposing no necessity and clapping no collars on them. (5) For he says, "Ye that thirst, *come* to me,"[69] and again, "If any man *will come* after me let him follow me."[70] And he said the same through Isaiah: "If ye be *willing* and hearken."[71] And later, to show who was speaking, the prophet said, "For the mouth of the Lord hath spoken these things."[72]

---

[67] 1 Cor 12:11.

[68] ἀπέστειλε με κύριος . . . ἠναγκασμένον, θέλοντα καὶ μὴ θέλοντα, γνῶθειν γνῶσιν θεοῦ. Maximilla refers to herself (her spirit?) in the masculine; Epiphanius, however, reads, "The Lord hath sent me to impart knowledge of God to the willing and the unwilling," and refutes on this basis.

[69] John 7:37.

[70] Matt 16:24.

[71] Isa 1:19.

[72] Isa 58:14.

13,6 And are you fully aware of their disagreement with the sacred text, and the difference between their notion and opinion, and the faith and following of God? (7) For Maximilla also said that she compelled the willing and the unwilling [to know God]—so that her very words make her a liar. She neither taught the knowledge of God—which she did not know—to the willing, nor compelled the unwilling [to learn it]. (8) It goes without saying that the whole world does not know Maximilla's name, or her misstatements. And their erroneous notion is all wrong, and no part of God's truth.

14,1 Phrygians also venerate a deserted spot in Phrygia, a town once called Pepuza though it is now leveled, and say that the heavenly Jerusalem will descend there.[73] (2) And so they resort there, celebrate certain mysteries[74] on the site, and, as they suppose, sanctify < themselves >. For this breed is also to be found in Cappadocia and Galatia—and in Phrygia as I said, which is why the sect is called the Phrygian. But they are in Cilicia too and, for the most part, in Constantinople.

14,3 But to omit nothing that bears on the name of every sect I have discussed, I shall also speak, in its turn, of the Tascodrugians'. For this name is used either in this sect itself, or the one after it, which is called the sect of the Quintillianists—for this name too originates with these people themselves.

14,4 They are called Tascodrugians for the following reason. Their word for "peg" is "tascus," and "drungus" is their word for "nostril" or "snout." And since they put their licking finger, as we call it, on their nostril when they pray, for dejection, if you please, and would-be righteousness, some people have given them the name of Tascodrugians, or "nose-pickers."[75]

14,5 They say that a shocking, wicked thing is done in this sect—or in its sister sect, the one called the sect of the Quintillianists or Priscillianists, and Pepuzians. (6) At a certain festival they pierce a child—just a little

---

[73] Eus. H. E. 5.18.2; 13; Cyr. Cat. 16.8; Filast. Haer. 49.4. Tertullian speaks of the descent of the heavenly Jerusalem without mentioning Pepuza, Adv. Marc. 3.24.3–4. Jerome says that Montanist patriarchs reside at Pepuza, Ep. 41.3.2.

[74] Tertullian speaks of distinctively Montanist rites *in diversis provinciis*, Jejun. 13.5, cf. 13.8.

[75] Filast. Haer. 76 appears to describe this group under the name of "Passalorinchitae." At Haer. 75 he speaks of "Ascodrugians," who dance wildly around an inflated wineskin.

baby—all over its body with bronze needles and get its blood for sacrifice, if you please.[76]

15,1 But I am content with what I have said about this sect in its turn, beloved. I promised to withhold nothing about any sect I know, but to disclose what I have learned by word of mouth, and from treatises, documents, and persons who truly confirmed my notion. (2) Thus, by writing no more than I know, I will < not > appear to be guilty of inventing my own false charges against people, and of getting into the same position as they by not telling the truth, but declaring things that they have neither seen, heard, nor learned from the true teaching of the Holy Spirit.

15,3 I give all the facts, as I said, with accuracy, about each sect, and make these shocking disclosures for the readers' correction. And I prepare a sort of medicine made of refutation from the words of sacred scripture and right reasonings, (4) and compound < it > in the Lord for two purposes: for the recovery of the sufferers from their illness and great pain, but for (5) a prophylactic, as it were, for those who have never contracted the disease. Thus may I too be called a disciple of the Lord's disciples for imparting the medicine of the truth to the wise, and a disciple of the Savior himself, the help of bodies and souls.

15,6 Now, with the power of Christ, let me set myself to go on to the rest, since I feel that this here will be enough for this sect. I have crushed its poison, and the venom on its hooked fangs, with the cudgel of the truth of the cross. For it is like the viper of hemorrhage, whose mischief is to drain the blood from its victims' entire bodies and so cause their deaths. (7) For this sect and the sect of Quintillianists do the same thing. They stab the body of an innocent child and get its blood to drink, and delude their victims by < pretending* >, if you please, that this is initiation in the name of Christ.

15,8 But as we go on to the rest by the power of Christ, let us call upon his truth that we may track down the meaning of each imposture, and after detecting and refuting it, render our accustomed thanks in all things to God.

---

[76] Cyr. Cat. 16.8: Jer. Ep. 41.4.1. Theod. Haer. Fab. 3.2 and Praedestinatus 26 report this as a rumor which may not be true.

Against Quintillianists or Pepuzians, also known as Priscillianists,[1] *with whom the Artotyrites are associated. 29, but 49 of the series*

1,1 The Quintillianists in their turn, who are also called Pepuzians and known as Artotyrites and Priscillianists, are the same as the Phrygians and derive from them, but in a certain way are different. (2) For the Quintillianists or Priscillianists say that either Quintilla[2] or Priscilla—I cannot say for certain, but one of them, as I said, slept in Pepuza and, as the deluded women said, Christ came to her and slept beside her, thus: (3) "Christ came to me in the form of a woman,"[3] she said, "dressed in a white robe, imbued me wisdom, and revealed to me that this place is holy, and that Jerusalem will descend from heaven here." (4) And so even to this day, they say, certain women—men too—are initiated there on the site, so that those women or men may await Christ and see him.[4] (5) (They have women they call prophetesses.[5] I am not sure, though, whether this custom is theirs or the Phrygians'; they are associated and have the same ideas.)

2,1 They use the Old and the New Testaments, and likewise affirm the resurrection of the dead. Their founder is Quintilla, along with Priscilla who was also a Phrygian prophetess.

2,2 They cite many texts pointlessly, and give thanks to Eve because she was the first to eat from the tree of wisdom.[6] And as scriptural support for their ordination of women as clergy, they say that Moses' sister was a prophetess.[7] What is more, they say, Philip had four daughters who prophesied.[8]

---

[1] Only Epiphanius distinguishes this group from the Montanists, though PsT 7.2 suggests that there are Montanist sub-groups named for their leaders. Epiphanius might have conjectured the existence of this sect from the distinctiveness of Priscilla's vision, or from its occurrence in a document different from his collection of Montanist prophecies.

[2] Only Epiphanius mentions Quintilla.

[3] "Tetrad" appears in female form at Iren. Haer. 1.14.1; Protennoia does the same at NHC Tri. Prot. 42,17–18.

[4] Or, "may live long enough to see Christ."

[5] Tertullian considers woman prophets a mark of divine endorsement and cites 1 Cor 11:5 (Adv. Marc. 5.8.11); cf. De Anima 9.4.

[6] Eve is the "instructor of life" at NHL Orig. Wld. 113,33; cf. Apoc. Adam 69,14–18. For further material see Pagels.

[7] Did. Trin. 3.41.23.

[8] Eus. H. E. 3.37.1; 5.17.3; Did. Trin. 3.41.3.

2,3 In their church seven virgins often come in carrying lamps, if you please, dressed in white, to prophesy to the people. (4) They deceive the congregation with a show of some sort of inspiration and, as though urging them to the mourning of penitence,[9] get them all weeping, shedding tears and pretending to mourn for humankind. (5) They have woman bishops, presbyters and the rest;[10] they say that none of this makes any difference because "In Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female."[11] (6) This is what I have learned [about them]. However, they call them Artotyrites because they set forth bread and cheese in their mysteries and celebrate their mysteries with them.[12]

3,1 But every human illusion < comes of > deserting the right faith and opting for something impossible, and for various frenzies and secret rites. For if they do not cling to the anchor of the truth but entrust themselves < to their own reason* >, their minds are always maddened, and bring them [to frenzy] for any reason at all. (2) Even though it is because of Eve that they ordain women to the episcopate and presbyterate, they should listen to the Lord when he says, "Thy resort shall be to thine husband, and he shall rule over thee."[13] (3) And they have overlooked the apostle's command, "I suffer not a woman to speak, or to have authority over a man,"[14] and again, "The man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man,[15] and, "Adam was not deceived, but Eve, deceived first, fell into condemnation."

What a profusion of error there is in this world!

3,4 And now that < I have squashed* > a toothless, witless < serpent* > like a gecko, I shall pass this sect by, beloved, and go on to the rest, calling upon God as the help of my lowliness, and for the fulfillment of my promise.

---

[9] For Montanist emphasis on penitence see Eus. H. E. 5.18.9.

[10] A prophetess celebrates the eucharist, preaches and baptizes at Firmilian/Cyprian Ep 75.10; Epiphanius criticizes the Marcionite practice of baptism by women at Pan 42,4,5.

[11] Gal 3:28.

[12] Sacramental use of cheese is found at Act. Perpet. 4.9; possibly of milk at Tert. Adv. Marc. 1.14.3.

[13] Gen 3:16.

[14] 1 Tim 2:12.

[15] 1 Tim 2:14.

Against Quartodecimans.[1] *Number 30, but 50 of the series*

1,1 From these two intermingled sects of Phrygians and Quintillianists or Priscillianists, another one, called the sect of the Quartodecimans, emerged in its turn. (2) These too hold all the doctrines that the church does; but they lose hold of them all because of not adhering to the proper order and teaching, but still to Jewish fables. And yet their doctrines are not the same as the Jews', "For they know not what they say nor whereof they affirm."[2]

1,3 Quartodecimans contentiously keep the Passover on one day, once a year,[3] even though their doctrine of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is good and in agreement with < ours >, and they accept the prophets, apostles and evangelists, and likewise confess the resurrection of the flesh, the judgment to come and everlasting life. (4) But they have fallen into an error, and one of no small importance, by supposedly following the letter of the Law's saying, "Cursed is he who shall not keep the Passover on the fourteenth day of the month."[4] (5) Others though, who keep the same one day and fast and celebrate the mysteries on the same one day, boast that they have found the precise date in the Acts of Pilate, if you please; it says there that the Savior suffered on the eighth before the Kalends of April.[5]

1,6 They will keep the Passover on whichever day it is that the fourteenth of the month falls;[6] but the ones in Cappadocia keep the eighth before the Kalends of April as that same one day. (7) And there is no little dissension in their ranks, since some say the fourteenth day of the month, but some, the eighth before the Kalends of April. (8) Furthermore, I have found copies of the Acts of Pilate which say that the passion came on the fifteenth before the Kalends of April.[7] But in fact, as I know from much minute investigation, I have found that the Savior suffered on the thir-

[1] Cf. Eus. H. E. 5.23–24; Hippol. Haer. 8.18; PsT 8.1. These are authors Epiphanius knows, but at 1,5–8 he shows further knowledge, independent of them, of the Quartodecimans.

[2] 1 Tim 1:7.

[3] I.e., rather than keeping a week-long fast. Cf. Eus. H.E. 5.24.12 (Irenaeus).

[4] Cf. Lev 23:5; Num 9:4–5; Deut 27:28, and see Hippol. Haer. 8.18.1.

[5] I.e., the day of the spring equinox. Cf. Acts of Pilate, Prologue; Hippol. In Dan. 4:23; Tert. Adv. Jud. 8.

[6] So Hippol. Haer. 8.18.1.

[7] Probably a variant date of the spring equinox (Strobel p. 223).

teenth before the Kalends of April[8] Some, however, say it was the tenth before the Kalends of April.[9]

1,9 But the Quartodecimans too have departed from the prescribed path. (But I am afraid of making my discussion of them extremely long too, for I have a great deal to say.) (2,1) After he had finished the entire Law, the law-giver Moses was commanded by God to put all the curses in the last book, Deuteronomy—not only the curse about the Passover, but the ones about circumcision, tithing and offerings. (2) Thus if they avoided one curse they fell foul of many. They would be accursed if they were not circumcised and accursed if they did not tithe; and they are accursed for not presenting offerings at Jerusalem. (3) Shame on the people who get themselves into all kinds of quarrels! Well may we quote the wise saying of the Preacher, expressly set forth for us by the Holy Spirit: "This the preacher doth know, that God hath made the wise man a straight path, but they have sought for themselves many ways."[10]

2,4 In what way is their idea not wrong? In the first place, if they keep the Passover on the fourteenth of the month, they need to take the lamb on the tenth and keep it until the fourteenth, and there is no longer one day of fasting but five: the tenth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth. (5) But if the paschal lamb is killed toward evening, by its dawning this fourteenth day makes six days in the fast, and there will no longer be one fast day—and their quest for one day has failed, since there is no one day.

2,6 For the types [of the Lord's death and resurrection] have been combined at the cost of no little godly study. Christ needed to be slain on the fourteenth of the month in accordance with the Law, so that their light that illumined them under the Law would go out for them, since the sun had risen and hidden the light of the moon. (7) For the moon is on the wane after the fourteenth. Hence even in the Law the Jewish synagogue was dimmed by Christ's incarnation and passion, and the Gospel outshone it—although, because the Law was not abolished but served to prove the truth, the Law was not destroyed but fulfilled.

---

[8] This date is given in the spurious Acta of the Council of Caesarea 1; Martin of Bracara De Pascha 1; Niceta of Remesiana (=Tractatus Athanasii) 1; Soz. Hist. 7.18. Sozomen says that it is the date celebrated by Montanists.

[9] Consularia Constant. MG. Auct. Antiq. 9.220; Chronicon Paschale 218; Lactantius Div. Inst. 4.10.8.

[10] Eccles 7:29.

2,8 So too, at the celebration of the Passover in Jericho the sacred scripture at once added, "And the children of Israel kept the Passover and ate it in Gilgal, and the manna ceased."[11] (9) This was its further testimony to them, and its prophecy that their angelic, heavenly food, which they called manna,[12] would come to an end because of the Lord's suffering for their denial of God.

3,1 But since she makes the combination she does, God's holy church does not miss the truth of the observance of this mystery in any way. (2) She observes not only the fourteenth day, but also the seventh as it recurs regularly < in the > order of the seven days of the week, so that the resurrection and the festival will correspond with the deeds of the Lord < just as > they do with the type [of them]. (3) And she observes not only the fourteenth day of the lunar month, but the course of the sun as well, so that we will not keep two Passovers in one year and not even celebrate one in another.

3,4 We observe the fourteenth day, then, but we wait until after the equinox and bring the end of our fulfillment [of the commandment][13] to the sacred Lord's Day. But we take the lamb on the tenth day by acknowledging the name of Jesus through its "iota,"[14] so that, < by > the true canonical practice of them, we will neglect no part of this life-giving < festival > of the Passover in accordance with the entire truth.

3,5 However, since by Christ's power I am done with the swollenness of this gudgeon or toad, I shall pass it by and give my attention to the rest, making my usual supplication for God's help.

6,1 Against the sect which does not accept the Gospel according to John, and his Revelation. 31, but 51 of the series[1]

1,1 Following these sects—after the the ones called Phrygians, Quintillianists and Quartodecimans—there arose another sect, like a feeble snake which cannot bear the odor of dittany—that is, storax—or of frankincense or southernwood, or the smell of pitch, incense, lignite or hartshorn.

---

[11] Josh 5:10–12.
[12] I.e., the Law.
[13] The commandment, "They shall take to them every man a lamb . . ." Exod 12:3–6.
[14] Ten.
[1] Individuals or groups who took this position are described at Iren. Haer. 3.11.9; Eus. H. E. 7.25.2–3; Hippol. Capitula Adversus Gaium. Epiph may himself have read works of this nature, see 51,29,1; 5.

(2) For those who are familiar with them say that these substances have the effect of driving poisonous snakes away; and some call dittany "tittany"[2] because professional physicians use it as an aid for women in childbirth.[3] I may thus appropriately compare it with the divine Word who descended from the heavens, and has been begotten of the Father outside of time and without beginning.

1,3 Solomon says of a foolish, worthless woman, "She hateth a word of sureness."[4] These people too have hated the Gospel's surenesses, since they are of the earth and at enmity with the heavens. (4) Therefore, for fear of the Holy Spirit's voice which says, "The voice of the Lord restoreth the hinds,"[5] < they reject his proclamation of the divine Word* > who told his servants and apostles, "Lo, I have given you power to tread upon serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy."[6] (5) For this is the voice that restores the hinds, the voice which resounded in the world through the holy apostles and evangelists, to trample on the devil's opposition. < One of > these, St. John, checked this with the utmost effectiveness, and tried the power of the deceived, and of the snakelike heretics.

2,1 But these people will not prevail in the ark. The holy Noah is directed by God's command to make the ark secure, as God says to him, "Thou shalt pitch it within and without"[7,8]—to prefigure God's holy church, which has the power of pitch, which drives the horrid, baneful, snake-like teachings away. For where pitch is burned, no snake can remain. (2) The holy storax incense stuns them, and they avoid its sweet odor. And the power of southernwood or frankincense < drives them away* > if it grows over the serpent itself and sprouts above its den.

2,3 For in the same place—I mean in Asia—where Ebion, Cerinthus and their coterie preached that Christ is a mere man and the product of sexual intercourse, the Holy Spirit caused this sacred plant or shrub to sprout which has driven the serpent away and destroyed the devil's tyranny. (4) For in his old age St. John was told by the Holy Spirit to preach there,[9] and bring back those who had lost their way on the journey—

---

[2] τίκταμνον.
[3] τικτούσων.
[4] Prov 11:15.
[5] Ps 28:9.
[6] Luke 10:19.
[7] Gen 6:14.
[8] The pun is on ἐπασφαλίσασθαι and ἀσφαλτώσεις.
[9] Iren. Haer. 3.2.1, and the reconstructed monarchian prologue at Corssen pp. 80–81.

[bring them], not by force but of their own free choice, by revealing God's light to the obedient, which is in God's holy teaching. (5) But how long must I go on? It is a fact that no snake can stay any longer or make its den where southernwood grows; and where God's true teaching is, a den of snake-like teaching cannot prevail but will be destroyed.

3,1 Now these Alogi say—this is what I call them. They shall be so called from now on, and let us give them this name, beloved, Alogi. (2) For they believed in the heresy for which < that* > name < was a good one* >, since it rejects the books by John. As they do not accept the Word which John preaches, they shall be called Dumb.[10] (3) As complete strangers to the truth's message they deny its purity, and accept neither John's Gospel nor his Revelation.

3,4 And if they accepted the Gospel but rejected the Revelation, I would say they might be doing it from scrupulousness, and refusing to accept an "apocryphon" because of the deep and difficult sayings in the Revelation. (5) But since they do not accept the books in which St. John actually proclaimed his Gospel, it must be plain to everyone that they and their kind are the ones of whom St. John said in his General Epistles, "It is the last hour and ye have heard that Antichrist cometh; even now, lo, there are many Antichrists."[11] (6) For they offer excuses [for their behavior]. Knowing, as they do, that St. John was an apostle and the Lord's beloved, that the Lord rightly revealed the mysteries to him, and < that he* > leaned upon his breast, they are ashamed to contradict him and try to object to these mysteries for a different reason. For they say that they are not John's composition but Cerinthus', and have no right to a place in the church.

4,1 And it can be shown at once, from this very attack, that they "understand neither what they say nor whereof they affirm."[12] How can the words which are directed against Cerinthus be by Cerinthus? (2) Cerinthus says that Christ is of recent origin and a mere man, while John has proclaimed that < he > is the eternal Word, and has come from on high and been made flesh. From the very outset, then, their worthless quibble is exposed as foolish, and unaware of its own refutation. (3) For they appear to believe what we do; but because they do not hold to the certainties of the message God has revealed to us through St. John, they will be convicted of shouting against the truth about things which they do

[10] Ἄλογοι.
[11] 1 John 2:16.
[12] 1 Tim 1:7.

not know. (4) They will be known to them, though, if they choose to sober up and take notice; I am not discarding the teachings of the Holy Spirit in all their importance and certainty.

4,5 For they say against themselves—I prefer not to say, "against the truth"—that John's books do not agree with the other apostles.[13] And now they think they can attack his holy, inspired teaching. (6) "And what," they argue, "did he say, 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.'[14] And, 'The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we knew his glory, glory as of an only Son of a Father, full of grace and truth.'[15] (7) And immediately afterwards, 'John bare witness and cried, saying, This he of whom I said unto you,'[16] and, 'This is the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world.'[17]

"And next he says, 'They that heard him said, Rabbi, where dwellest thou?'[18] and in the same breath, (8) 'On the morrow Jesus would go forth into Galilee, and findeth Philip, and saith unto him, Follow me.'[19] (9) And shortly thereafter he says, 'And after three days there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee, and Jesus was called, and his disciples, to the marriage supper, and his mother was there.'[20] (10) But the other evangelists say that he spent forty days in the wilderness tempted by the devil, and then came back and chose his disciples."

4,11 And dense as they are, they don't know that each evangelist was concerned to say what the others had said, in agreement with them, while at the same time revealing what they had not said, but had omitted. For the will was not theirs; both their order and their teaching came from the Holy Spirit. (12) If our opponents want to attack John, they must learn that the other three did not begin from the same point in the narrative.

For Matthew was the first to become an evangelist. The first issuance of the Gospel was assigned to him. (I have spoken largely of this in another Sect;[21] however, I shall not mind dealing with the same things again, as proof of the truth and in refutation of the erring.) (5,1) As I said, Matthew was privileged to be the first < to issue > the Gospel, and this was

---

13 So, apparently, did the second century heretic Gaius. See Labriolle p. 48.
14 John 1:1.
15 John 1:14.
16 John 1:15; 30.
17 John 1:29.
18 John 1:38.
19 John 1:43.
20 John 2:1–2.
21 Pan. 20,8,4; 30,3,7.

absolutely right. Because he had repented of many sins, and had risen from the receipt of custom and followed Him who came for man's salvation and said, "I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance,"[22] it was Matthew's duty to present the message of salvation < first >, as an example for us, who would be saved like this man who was restored in the tax office and turned from his iniquity. From him men would learn the graciousness of Christ's advent.

5,2 For after the forgiveness of his sins he was granted the raising of the dead, the cleansing of leprosy, miracles of healing and the casting out of devils, so that he < would > not merely persuade his hearers by his speech, but publish[23] good tidings with actual deeds—[publish] the tidings of their salvation through repentance, to the perishing; the tidings that they would arise, to the fallen; and the tidings that they would be quickened, to the dead.

5,3 Matthew himself wrote and issued the Gospel in the Hebrew alphabet, and did not begin at the beginning, but traced Christ's pedigree from Abraham. "Abraham begat Isaac," he said, "and Isaac begat Jacob,"[24] and so on down to Joseph and Mary. (4) And he wrote at the beginning, 'The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David," and then said, "the son of Abraham."[25] Then, coming to his main point, he said, "The birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise. When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. (5) And Joseph, being a just man, sought to put her away privily. And lo, the angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream saying, Put not away thy wife; for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. (6) For lo, she shall bear a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus. He shall save his people from their sins. And this was done," he said, "to fulfill that which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold the virgin shall be with child,"[26] and so on.

5,7 "And Joseph," he said, "being raised from sleep, did so and took unto him his wife, and knew her not till she brought forth her first-born son, and he called his name Jesus. (8) Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judaea in the days of Herod the king, behold, there came wise men from the east to Jerusalem, saying, Where is he that is born king of

---

[22] Matt 9:13.
[23] Klostermann: κηρύξῃ; Holl: <δύνηται> κηρύξαι.
[24] Matt 1:2.
[25] Matt 1:1.
[26] Matt 1:18–23.

the Jews? For we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him."[27]

5,9 Now then, where is the story of Zacharias? Where are the subjects Luke discussed? Where is the vision of the angel? Where is the prophecy about John the Baptist? Where is the rebuke of Zacharias, so that he could not speak until the angel's words had come true?

5,10 Where are the things Gabriel told the Virgin? Where is his reassurance, when Mary answered the angel himself with wisdom and asked, "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?"[28] And where is his accurate and clear explanation, "The Spirit of the Lord shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee?"[29]

6,1 Well, what shall I say? Because Matthew did not report the events which Luke related, can St. Matthew be in disagreement with the truth? Or is St. Luke not telling the truth, because he has said < nothing > about the things that had been previously dealt with by Matthew? (2) Didn't God give each evangelist his own assignment, so that each of the four evangelists whose duty was to proclaim the Gospel could find what he was to do and proclaim some things in agreement and alike to show that they came from the same source, but otherwise[30] describe what another had omitted, as each received his proportionate share from the Spirit?

6,3 Now what shall we do? Matthew declares that Mary gave birth in Bethlehem < and > < describes* > Christ's incarnation in terms of the pedigree he traces from Abraham's and David's line. St. Mark, we find, says none of this (4) but begins the Gospel with the event that took place in the Jordan and says, "The beginning of the Gospel, as it is written in Isaiah the prophet, A voice of one crying in the wilderness."[31] (5) < Is Mark lying, then? Of course not! There was no reason for him to repeat information which had already been given* >. Similarly, the things St. John discussed, and confirmed in the Holy Spirit, were not just meant to repeat what had already been proclaimed, but to speak of the teachings the others had had to leave to John.

6,6 For the whole treatment of the Gospel was of this nature. After Matthew had proclaimed Christ's generation, his conception through the Holy Spirit, < and > his incarnation as a descendant of David and Abraham,

---

[27] Matt 1:24–2:2.
[28] Luke 1:34.
[29] Luke 1:35.
[30] Klostermann ἄλλος <ἄλλως>, MSS ἄλλος.
[31] Mark 1:1–3.

an error arose in those who had not understood the narrative which was intended in good faith to provide assurance of these things from the Gospel. (Not that the Gospel was responsible for their error; their own wrong notion was.) (7) And this was why Cerinthus and Ebion held that Christ was a mere man, and < misled* > Merinthus,[32] Cleobius[33] or Cleobulus,[34] Claudius, Demas[35] and Hermogenes,[36] who had loved this world and left the way of the truth. (8) For they contradicted the Lord's disciples at that time, and tried to use the genealogy from Abraham and David as proof of their nonsense—not in good faith, but seizing on it as an excuse. (9) For they were often contradicted by St. John and his friends, Leucius and many others. But shamelessness struck its forehead, and did its best to bring its own woes on itself.

6,10 Mark, who came directly after Matthew, was ordered by St. Peter at Rome to issue the Gospel, and after writing it was sent by St. Peter to Egypt. (11) He was one of the seventy-two who had been dispersed by the Lord's saying, "Unless a man eat my flesh and drink my blood, he is not worthy of me"[37]—as < can be > plainly proved to the readers of the Gospels. Still, after his restoration by Peter he was privileged to proclaim the Gospel by the Holy Spirit's inspiration.

6,12 He began his proclamation where the Spirit told him, and put the opening of it at the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar, thirty years after Matthew's account. (13) Since he was a second evangelist, and gave no clear indication of the divine Word's descent from on high—he does this everywhere plainly, but not with as much precision [as Matthew]—a darkening of their minds fell once more upon these misguided people, so that they were not held worthy of the Gospel's illumination. (14) "Look," they said, "here is a second Gospel too with an account of Christ, and nowhere does it say that his generation is heavenly. Instead," they said, "the Spirit descended upon him in the Jordan and < there came* > a voice, 'This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased.'"[38]

7,1 Since this was the conclusion that had been reached by these stupid people, the Holy Spirit compelled St. Luke and spurred him on to raise the

---

[32] Pan. 28,8,1. But there Epiphanius is unsure whether Merinthus is a heretic so named, or an alternate name for Cerinthus.
[33] Eus. H.E. 4.22.5 (Hegesippus); Didascalia 23 Connolly p.; Const. Ap. 6.8.1.
[34] Cf. Ps.-Ignatius Trall. 11.
[35] Col 4:14; Philem 24; 2 Tim 4:10.
[36] 2 Tim 1:15.
[37] Cf. John 6:53.
[38] Cf. Mark 1:10–11.

minds of the misguided from the lowest depths, as it were, and once again take up what the other evangelists had omitted. (2) < But > lest some misguided person should think his description of Christ's generation fictitious, he carried the matter back, and for accuracy's sake went through his whole account in the fullest detail. (3) And he produced those who had been ministers of the word as his witnesses in support of the truth; and he said, "Inasmuch as many have attacked,"[39] to show that there were attackers—I mean Cerinthus, Merinthus and the others.

7,4 What does he say next? "It seemed good to me, having attended closely to them which from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word, to write unto thee, most excellent Theophilus"—whether he said this because he was then writing to someone named Theophilus, or to every lover of God—"< that thou mayest know > the certainty of the things wherein thou hast been instructed."[40] (5) And he said that the instruction was already written, as though Theophilus had already been instructed by others, but had not learned the precise truth from them with certainty.

7,6 Next he says, "There was in the days of Herod the king a priest named Zacharias of the course of the high priest Abijah, and his wife was of the daughters of Aaron, and her name was Elizabeth."[41] (7) And he begins before Matthew. Matthew had indicated a period of thirty years from the beginning, while Mark—like Matthew and Luke—had set down what happened after < the > thirty years, the event which truly took place in the Jordan. (8) But Matthew began his account thirty years before the event at the Jordan and the baptism. Now Luke told of the period of six months before the Savior's conception, and again, the period of the nine months and a few days following the conception of the Lord, so that the entire period of time [described in Luke] is thirty-one years and a bit more.

7,9 Luke also describes the shepherds' vision, [which was shown them] by the angels who brought them the tidings. And he describes how Christ was born in Bethlehem, laid in a manger in swaddling clothes, and circumcised the eighth day, and how they made an offering for him forty days later in obedience to the Law, Simeon took <him> in his arms, and Anna the daughter of Phanuel gave thanks for him; and how he went away to Nazareth and returned to Jerusalem each year with his parents, who

[39] Luke 1:1.
[40] Luke 1:3–4.
[41] Luke 1:5.

made the offerings for him that the Law required. But neither Matthew nor Mark has dealt with any of this, and certainly not John. Instead, they said, "the Spirit descended upon him in the Jordan and < there came* > a voice, 'This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased.'"[42]

8,1 And so, as they go through their refutations of the Gospel account, certain other Greek philosophers—I mean Porphyry, Celsus,[43] and that dreadful, deceitful serpent of Jewish extraction, Philosabbatius—accuse the holy apostles, though they [themselves] are natural and carnal, make war by fleshly means and cannot please God, and have not understood < the things which have been said > by the Spirit.

8,2 Tripping over the words of the truth because of the blindness of their ignorance, each < of them > lit upon this point and said, "How can the day of his birth in Bethlehem have a circumcision eight days after it, and forty days later the pilgrimage to Jerusalem and the things Simeon and Anna did for him, (3) when an angel appeared to him the night he was born, after the arrival of the magi who came to worship him, and who opened their bags and offered him gifts? As it says, 'An angel appeared to him saying, Arise, take thy wife and the young child and go unto Egypt, for Herod seeketh the young child's life.'[44] (4) Now then, if he was taken to Egypt the very night he was born and was there until Herod died, how can he stay [in Bethlehem] for eight days and be circumcised? Or how can Luke < fail to* > be caught in a lie when he tells us that Jesus was brought to Jerusalem after* < forty days* >?"—so they say in blasphemy against their own heads, because he says, "On the fortieth day they brought him to Jerusalem and < returned > to Nazareth from there."[45]

9,1 And the ignoramuses do not know the power of the Holy Spirit; to each evangelist it was given to describe the true events of each time and season. And Matthew reported only Christ's generation by the Holy Spirit and conception without a man's seed, but said nothing about circumcision, or the two years—any of the things that happened to him after his birth. (2) Instead, as the true word of God bears witness, he describes the coming of the magi. For Herod asked the magi for the time, and demanded the exact time of the star's appearance, and Matthew gave the

---

[42] Cf. Mark 1:10–11.

[43] See Orig. Cels. 1.40; 48; 91.5–7. Origen mentions the seeming discrepancy between Matthew and Luke at In Joh. 10.3.

[44] Matt 2:13.

[45] Cf. Luke 2:22; 39.

magi's answer, that it was no more than two years before. Thus this period of time is not the one Luke deals with.

9,3 Luke, however, describes the events before < the > two years—whereas Matthew spoke of Christ's birth and then skipped to the time two years later and indicated what happened after < the > two years. (4) And so, when Herod deliberated after the magi's departure by another route, he assumed that < the > new-born child himself would be found among all the other children and killed along with them. (5) For he ordered the killing of all the children in the vicinity of Bethlehem who had been two years old or less on the very day the magi came to him. Who, then, can fail to realize that the child who had been born was two years old when the magi came?

9,6 Indeed, [Luke's] account itself makes the facts clear in their entirety. For Luke says that the child was swaddled as soon as he was born, and lay in a manger and cave because there was no room in the inn. (7) For a census was then in progress, and the people who had been scattered at the time of the wars in the Maccabees' time were dispersed all over the world, and very few had continued to live in Bethlehem. And thus Bethlehem is called the *city* of David in one copy of the Evangelists, while in another it calls it a village, because it had come to occupy a small area. (8) But when the emperor Augustus' decree was issued, and those who had been dispersed had to go to Bethlehem for enrollment because of their family origins, the influx of the multitudes filled the place, and because of the crowding there was no room in the inn.

9,9 But then, after the census, everyone went back to wherever they lived and room was made in Bethlehem. (10) Now when < the > first year was over and the second year had passed, Christ's parents came from Nazareth to Bethlehem as though to the original gathering—as a sort of memorial because of what had happened there. (11) Thus the arrival of the magi occurred on this occasion, and probably not during Mary's and Joseph's visit at the time of the census which Luke mentions. For the magi did not find Mary in the cavern where she gave birth but, as the Gospel says, the star led them to the place where the young child was. (12) And they entered *the house* and found the baby with Mary—no longer in a manger, no longer in a cave, but in a house—showing the exact truth and the two-year interval, that is, from Christ's birth until the arrival of the magi.

9,13 And the angel appeared that night, two years after the birth, and said to take the mother and child to Egypt. Thus Joseph did not go back again to Nazareth but escaped to Egypt with the child and his mother,

and spent another two years there. And so, after Herod's death, the angel < appeared* > again < and* > sent them back to Judaea.

10,1 The Lord was born in the thirty-third year of Herod, the magi came in the thirty-fifth, and in the thirty-seventh year Herod died and his son Archelaus inherited the throne and reigned for nine years, as I have already said in other places.[46] (2) When Joseph heard of Archelaus he returned and went to Nazareth to make his home, and from there, in turn, went each year to Jerusalem.

10,3 Do you see the precision there is in the sacred Gospels about every event? But because the ignorant have blinded their own minds and do not know the intent of each saying, they simply shout and rave against the holy < evangelists >, saying nothing truthful but depriving themselves of life.

10,4 And then, after the first part of his narrative, Luke tells in turn how Christ went to Jerusalem in his twelfth year, thus leaving no opportunity for those who think, as Cerinthus, Ebion and the rest supposed, that Christ simply appeared in the world as a grown man and came to the Jordan to John. (5) For the serpent is a dreadful one, crawls a crooked course, and does not stand by one opinion; some suppose that Christ was engendered by sexual congress and a man's seed, but others, that he simply appeared as a [grown] man.

10,6 And this is why the holy evangelists write with precision, describing everything in exact detail. As though raising his mind from earth to the heavens, Luke expressly said, "And Jesus began to be about thirty years of age, being, *as was supposed*, the son of Joseph."[47] (7) Supposition is not fact; Joseph was in the position of a father to Jesus because this pleased God, but since he had no relations with Mary he was not his father. (8) He was simply called her husband because he was espoused to her as an old man of about eighty, with six sons (sic!)[48] by his actual first wife. But he was given this charge, as I have explained more precisely elsewhere. How could he be Christ's father when he had no conjugal relations? This is not possible.

11,1 But you will ask me, if he did not have her, why was he called her husband? Whoever doubts this does not know the Law's provision that once a woman is designated a man's wife, she is called the wife of the man

---

[46] E.g., at De Incarnatione 2.1–3.

[47] Luke 3:23.

[48] Anc. 60,1–3; Pan 30,29,8; 11; 78,7–9. But Epiphanius regularly gives Joseph four sons and two daughters, cf. Anc. 60,1; Pan. 78,7,6.

so designated, even though she is a virgin and still in her father's house. And thus the holy angel said, "Fear not to take unto thee thy *wife.*"[49]

11,2 And lest it be thought that < there is > some error in the Gospels—for the mystery is awesome and beyond human telling, and only to the Holy Spirit's children is the statement of it plain and clear—(3) < he says >, "He was about thirty years old, *supposedly* the son of Joseph, the son of Eli, the son of Matthan,"[50] and traces his ancestry to Abraham, where Matthew began. But he goes past Noah and comes to Adam, to indicate the first man, who was sought for by the One who came from his clay—that is, the One who came from the holy Virgin Mary. (4) (For Christ has come for that first man, and for those of his descendants who desire to inherit eternal life.)

And he goes past Adam and says, "Son of God."[51] (5) From this, at length, it was perfectly plain that he was the Son of God, but that he had come in the flesh as Adam's lineal descendant. But once more the misguided did not see the light; in their self-deceit, < and their preference of falsehood* > to truth, they spoke against what [Luke] said. (6) "Here is a third Gospel, Luke's," they said—(for Luke was given this commission. He too was one of the seventy-two who had been scattered because of the Savior's saying. But he was brought back to the Lord by St. Paul and told to issue his Gospel. And he preached in Dalmatia, Gaul, Italy and Macedonia first, but originally in Gaul, as Paul says of certain of his followers in his epistles, "Crescens is in Gaul."[52] It does not say, "in Galatia," as some mistakenly believe, but "in Gaul.")

12,1 But to get to the point. Although Luke had traced Christ's pedigree from its end to its beginning and reached the point where, to turn the misguided from their error, he hinted at the divine Word's advent and simultaneous union with his human nature, they did not understand. (2) Later, therefore, though from caution and humility he had declined to be an evangelist, the Holy Spirit compelled John to issue the Gospel in his old age when he was past ninety, after his return from Patmos under Claudius Caesar, and several years of his residence in Asia.

12,3 And John did not need to speak in detail of the [Savior's] advent; that had already been confirmed. But, as though he were following behind people and saw them in front of him choosing very rough, circuitous,

---

[49] Matt 1:20.
[50] Luke 3:23–24.
[51] Luke 3:38.
[52] 2 Tim 4:19.

thorny paths, John was concerned to recall them to the straight way, and took care to call out to them for their protection, "Why are you going wrong? Which turn are you taking? Where are you wandering off to, Cerinthus, Ebion and the rest? It is not as you suppose.

12,4 "Sure, plainly Christ was conceived in the flesh; look, I confess myself that the Word was made flesh. But don't suppose that he was himself only from the time when he was made flesh. He doesn't exist from Mary's time only, as each of us exists from the time of our conception, but before his conception is not there. (5) The holy divine Word, the Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, isn't just from Mary's time, or just from Joseph's time, or Eli's, Levi's, Zerubbabel's, Shealtiel's, Nathan's, David's, Jacob's or Isaac's. And not just from the time of Abraham, Noah or Adam, or the fifth day of creation, the fourth, the third, the second, or the creation of heaven and earth or the beginning of the universe.

12,6 "No, '*In the beginning was* the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made,'[53] and so on. (7) And then, 'There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the light, that all men through him might believe. He was not the light, but was sent to bear witness of the light. The true light, that lighteneth every man, was coming into the world. He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not. He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, who were born not of blood and flesh, but of God. (8) And the Word was made flesh,' he said, 'and dwelt among us. John bare witness of him and cried saying, 'This is he of who I spake unto you,' and, 'Of his fullness we have all received.'[54] And he said, 'I am not the Christ, but the voice of one crying in the wilderness.' "[55]

13,1 And when he is describing all this he says, "These things were done in Bethabara"—"Bethany" in other copies—"beyond Jordan."[56] (2) And after this he states that John's disciples asked Jesus, "Rabbi, where dwellest thou? And he said, Come and see. And they went, and remained with him that day."[57] (3) And the next day "It was about the tenth hour; one of

---

[53] John 1:1–2.
[54] John 1:6–16.
[55] John 1:20; 23.
[56] John 1:28. Origen reads "Bethabara" at In Joh. 6.40.
[57] John 1:38–39.

the two which had followed him was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother. He first findeth his own brother Simon and saith unto him, We have found Messiah, which is, being interpreted, Christ. He brought him to Jesus. Jesus looking on him saith, Thou art Simon the son of Jonah; thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation Peter.

13,4 "On the morrow he would go forth into Galilee and findeth Philip, and Jesus saith unto him, Follow me. Now Philip was of Bethsaida, the city of Andrew and Peter. Philip findeth Nathanael and saith unto him, We have found him of whom Moses in the Law, and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph. And Nathanael said unto him, Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth? Philip said unto him, Come and see. (5) Jesus seeing Nathanael come unto him saith of him, Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile. Nathanael saith unto him, Whence knowest thou me? Jesus answered and said unto him, Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig tree, I saw thee. Nathanael answered him and said, Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the king of Israel. (6) Jesus answered and said unto him, Because I said unto thee, I saw thee under the fig tree, believest thou? Verily, verily I say unto you, Ye shall see heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man. (7) And the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee,"[58] and so on.

All this will show that he came back to the Jordan after the forty days of the temptation, his return from the temptation itself, and his start for Nazareth and Galilee, as the other three evangelists have said. (8) This will also be shown by the words of John [the Baptist], "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."[59] And on another day, as he saw him on his way, he said, "This is he of whom I said unto you, He that cometh after me is preferred before me, for he was before me."[60] "And John bore witness," it says, "I saw the Spirit in the form of a dove descending and coming upon him."[61]

13,9 "*Bore* witness" and "This is he of whom I *said* unto you," suggest that John is speaking of two different times already past, to show that this is not the same as the time of the baptism, but a different one. (10) For Jesus did not go straight to John from the temptation, but went to Galilee first and then from Galilee to the Jordan, making this < the second time

[58] John 1:39–2:1.
[59] John 1:29.
[60] John 1:30.
[61] Cf. John 1:32.

he came* > to John. And so John says, "This was he of whom I *said* unto you;" and the Gospel goes on to say, "And John *bore* witness, I saw"—as though the thing had already taken place some time before.

14,1 The original call of Peter and Andrew is shown after this. For Andrew went to visit Jesus—one of the two who followed him, who were John's disciples but still lived in Galilee and now and then spent time with John. (2) And just after Andrew had stayed with him that day—it was about the sixth hour—he happened to meet his brother Simon that very same day, and said the words I have already mentioned, "We have found the Messiah." And he brought him to the Lord and so on, as the sequel—that Jesus told him, "Thou shalt be called Cephas"—shows.

14,3 "And the day following," it says, "Jesus would go forth into Galilee, and findeth Philip, and saith unto him, Follow me. Now Philip was of Bethsaida, the city of Andrew and Peter."[62] (4) And you see that this leads me to suppose—of the two disciples of John who had followed Jesus[63] he gave only the name of the one, Andrew, but did not give the name of the other. (5) This makes me think that, because they came from the same place, lived together, had the same trade and worked together, this disciple whose name he did not give was either John or James, < but > one of the sons of Zebedee. (6) For they should have been called first and then Philip, according to the order which is given in the Gospels: Peter first, then Andrew, then James, then John, and Philip after these. But never mind this now; there is a great deal of followup to this matter.

15,1 But it is time to return to the subject < and point out* > that, as it is plain to see, just as they < continued* > to practice their trade and attend to their discipleship while they were disciples of John, so, after spending their first day with Jesus, they went back the next day and fished, as the wording of the other Gospels indicates. (2) For after Jesus left on the following day, the sequel [in John] says at once, "On the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee, and the mother of Jesus was there. And Jesus was called, and his disciples, to the marriage."[64] (3) But from both these precise statements and the subject of them, we are given to understand that Jesus had also brought other disciples who [unlike Peter and the others] had remained with him—perhaps Nathanael and Philip, and some others. Andrew and the rest had left, but those who had remained with him were also invited to the wedding.

---

[62] John 1:43–44.
[63] I.e., at John 1:35.
[64] John 2:1–2.

15,4 And after performing this first miracle he went down to Capernaum and made his home there. And then he began to perform other miracles there—when he healed the man's withered hand, and Peter's mother-in-law as well. (5) (Peter was from Bethsaida but had married a woman from Capernaum, for the two places are not far apart. Jesus cured Peter's mother-in-law of fever and, because she was cured, she waited on them, so that the sequence of events is < plain* >.)

15,6 And after this he returned to Nazareth where he had been brought up. He then read the roll of the prophet Isaiah, and afterwards anticipated them himself and said, "Ye will surely say unto me this parable, Physician, heal thyself. What signs we have heard have been done in Capernaum, do also here in thy country."[65] And do you see the truthfulness of what follows? "And he did nothing[66] because of their unbelief."[67]

15,7 From there he went to Capernaum and settled there once more. And going to the sea, as Matthew says, he saw Simon Peter and his brother Andrew casting their nets—and, once again, James and John the sons of Zebedee. And he called them for last time, and they finally threw their nets away and followed him.

15,8 But Luke also indicates the certainty of the fact that they finally followed him for good without postponing their call any more. For he says, "When he was come unto the lake Gennesareth he saw Simon Peter and Andrew mending their nets, and he entered into the ship which was Simon Peter's and Andrew's"—but this shows that they allowed this from habit since he was already acquainted with them—and he boarded it and sat down. (9) When he told Peter, after his teaching, "Launch out into the deep and let down your nets,"[68] and they said, "Master"[69]—these men who had previously heard John say, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world"[70] and had spent one day with him were already calling Jesus "Master" because of John's testimony. (10) And they went out for their second catch, the later one, when they were amazed at the number of the fish, and Peter said, "Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord."[71] (For perhaps, indeed, he was penitent because of his having been called before and returning to his fish and the whole business of fishing.)

---

65 Cf. Luke 4:23.
66 MSS and Delahaye οὐδὲν, Holl οὐδὲν <σημεῖον>.
67 Cf. Matt 13:58; Mark 6:5.
68 Cf. Luke 5:1–4.
69 Luke 5:4–5.
70 John 1:29.
71 Luke 5:8.

(11) But to hearten him Jesus said, "Fear not"; he had not been rejected but could still lay claim to his call. For Jesus said, "From henceforth thou shalt be a fisher of men"[72] when they motioned their partners in the other boat to come and help with the catch. (12) For as it says, they were Simon's partners; I have mentioned this already because of the two who had followed Jesus < and > heard John say, < "Behold the Lamb of God." >[73] One of these two was Andrew, < as > I said, and I have a very good notion that the other, in turn, might have been one of the sons of Zebedee, because they were co-workers, in the same business, and partners.

15,13 And then, as it says, after all this the four left their boats and simply threw everything down and followed him, as Luke testifies. (14) And thus it is fully demonstrated that there is no obscurity or contradiction in the holy Gospels or between the evangelists, but that everything is plain. (15) There are, however, differences of time. For from this time forward, after Peter, John and the others had finally joined and followed him, he went teaching throughout Galilee and Judaea. And then, as the Gospel became widespread, he performed the rest of the miracles. Thus the overall order of events is this:

16,1 First, he was baptized on the twelfth of the Egyptian month Athyr, the sixth before the Ides of November of the Roman calendar.[74] (In other words, he was baptized a full sixty days before the Epiphany, which is the day of his birth in the flesh, (2) as the Gospel according to Luke testifies, "Jesus *began to be* about thirty years old, being, as was supposed, the son of Joseph."[75] Actually, he was twenty-nine years and ten months old—thirty years old but not quite—when he came for his baptism. This is why it says, "*began to be* about thirty years old." Then he was sent into the wilderness.

16,3 Those forty days of the temptation appear next, and the slightly more than two weeks—[two weeks] and two days—which he spent after his return from the temptation to Galilee, that is, to Nazareth and its vicinity. (4) And one day when he went to John—the day John said, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."[76] And the next day < when > "John, again, stood, and two of his disciples, and look-

---

[72] Luke 5:10.
[73] John 1:29.
[74] Holl ὅ ἐστιν κατὰ Ρωμαίους, MSS ὡς ἔφημεν.
[75] Luke 3:23.
[76] John 1:29.

ing upon Jesus as he walked, said, Behold the Christ, the Lamb of God."[77] Then it says, "The two disciples heard him and followed Jesus."[78]

16,5 As I said, this was the eighteenth day after the temptation, but the first after [Jesus' encounter with] John, when Andrew and the others followed Jesus and stayed with him that day—it was about the tenth hour—and when Andrew found his brother Simon and brought him to Jesus. (6) Then the Gospel says, "On the morrow the Lord would go forth into Galilee, and findeth Philip, and saith unto him, Follow me."[79] As the sequence of the Gospel indicates, this was the nineteenth day after the temptation, < and it includes* > the call of Philip and Nathanael.

16,7 And then, it says, there was a wedding in Cana of Galilee on the third day after the two days I have mentioned which followed [the encounter with] John. Now if the twenty days are added to the forty days of the temptation, this makes two months. And when these are combined with the ten months they make a year, that is to say, a full thirty years from the birth of the Lord. (8) And we find that Christ performed his first miracle, of the change of the water to wine, at the end of his thirtieth year, as you must realize if you follow the Gospel passages closely. (9) And then, after this first miracle, he performed the other miracles and presented his teaching, in token of his wondrous, inexpressible lovingkindness to all, and the wonderworking in the Gospels—so I have often been obliged to say because of the ignorance of the misguided people who venture to contradict the Gospels' accurate account, as it is set forth in order by the Holy Spirit.

17,1 Such an amount of accurate demonstration will leave no room for those who are their own opponents—I won't say, the truth's, because they can't be. (2) For it is plain from the start that everything else follows the baptism. Thus it is shown that the Lord underwent the forty day temptation in the wilderness after the day of the baptism, even though the Holy Spirit saw no need to make this known through John; it had already been indicated by the three evangelists. (3) And again, the other evangelists were not concerned with the other matters, since each is assisted by each. For when the truth is gathered from all the evangelists it is shown to be one, and in no conflict with itself.

---

[77] Cf. John 1:35–36.
[78] John 1:37.
[79] John 1:43.

17,4 For from that point—directly after the temptation, as I said,—he went from the wilderness to Nazareth and stayed there, no disciple being with him as yet. And from there he went down to John, and at once Peter was called through Andrew, and Nathanael through Philip. (5) But even though he sees that Andrew met Jesus first and then Peter was called, and through Andrew at that, no one need waste his time on doubts about this as well, and begin to be distressed about it. (6) The meeting with Andrew came first because Andrew was younger in years than Peter. But later on, in turn, at their final renunciation, this was at Peter's instance. For he was his brother's mentor; and the Lord knew this, for he is God, understands the inclinations of hearts, knows who is worthy to be ranked first, and chose Peter for the head of his disciples, as has been plainly shown everywhere.

17,7 Afterwards they came and stayed with him the first day, as I said, they traveled on the second, and on the third day came the first miracle while some disciples were with him—plainly not Andrew, Peter, James or John, but Nathanael and Philip, and some others. (8) And next, after going to Capernaum and returning to Nazareth, and going back to Capernaum from there and working part of the miracles, he returned to Nazareth once more and read the roll of the prophet Isaiah, where it says, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor,"[80] and so on. This took place some days after the Epiphany.

17,9 And after John's arrest he returned to Capernaum and at last made that his residence; and the final call of Peter, John and their brothers came at this time, when Jesus came [to them] beside the lake of Gennesareth. And thus the entire sequence of events [in the Gospels] is harmonized and contains no contradictions; the whole Gospel account is completely clear and has been given truthfully.

17,10 Then what has gotten into these people < who > have deceived their own minds and spewed this sect out on the world, that they reject the Gospel according to John? I was right to call their sect "Dumb"; they will not accept the divine Word who came from on high, the Word preached by John. (11) Not understanding the meaning of the Gospels they say, "Why have the other evangelists said that Jesus fled to Egypt from Herod, came back after his flight and remained at Nazareth, and then, after receiving the baptism, went into the wilderness, and returned after

[80] Luke 4:18.

that, and after his return began to preach? (18,1) But the Gospel [issued] in John's name lies," they say. "After 'The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us'[81] and a few other things, it says at once that there was a wedding in Cana of Galilee."

18,2 With their deliberate foolishness these people have not remembered that John < himself >, after saying that the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us—or in other words, became man—said that Jesus went to John the Baptist at the Jordan and was baptized by him. (3) < For > John himself testifies that John the Baptist said, 'This is he of whom I said unto you,"[82] "I saw the Holy Spirit descending in the form of a dove and remaining on him,"[83] and, "This is he that taketh away the sin of the world."[84]

18,4 You see that none of this is said from forgetfulness; John has omitted the matters Matthew dealt with. There was no more need for these things, but there was need for the full explanation, in reply to those who believed that Jesus was called Christ and Son of God [only] from the time of Mary, and [those who say that] he was originally a mere man but received the title, "Son of God," as a promotion in rank. (5) Thus in writing his account of Christ's coming from above, John is concerned with essentials—it is all important and essential, but the heavenly things are more so. (6) But these people say that the Gospel according to John is noncanonical because it did not mention these events—I mean the events of the forty-day temptation—and they do not see fit to accept it, since they are misguided about everything, and mentally blind.

19,1 The blessed John came fourth in the succession of evangelists. With his brother James he was the first after Peter and Andrew in the order of calling, but he was the last to issue a Gospel. He was not concerned to give information which had been adequately set down before him, but preferred what had not been said to what had been, and discoursed < along those lines >. (2) For Matthew begins with Abraham, but resumes his narrative after its beginning, and two [undescribed] years after Christ's birth. Mark, however, begins at the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar, but gives < no > account of < the > interval after the beginning. And Luke added a beginning before the beginning, his treatment of Elizabeth and Mary before < they > conceived.

---

[81] John 1:14.
[82] John 1:30.
[83] Cf. John 1:32.
[84] Cf. John 1:29.

19,3 John, however, who was earlier in his calling than they but became an evangelist later, confirms the events before the incarnation. For most of what he said was spiritual, since the fleshly things had already been confirmed. (4) He thus gives a spiritual account[85] of the Gift which came down to us from the Father who has no beginning, < and > of the Father's good pleasure took flesh in the holy Virgin's womb. (5) And he omitted nothing essential; but by the Holy Spirit's inspiration he < introduced > the divine Word who was before all ages, begotten of the Father without beginning and not in time, and told of his coming in the flesh for our sakes. In this way we may obtain full and precise knowledge, fleshly and divine, from four evangelists.

20,1 For when all the events of the baptism and temptation were over and then, as I have often said, Jesus had gone to spend a few days' < time > in Nazareth and nearby, and near Capernaum—< and > after he had met John at the Jordan < and returned to Galilee* >, taking a few disciples with him on the next day [after his meeting with John]—Jesus performed this first miracle in Cana, the third day after [he had met] John but the twentieth after his return from the temptation, and < began > his preaching. (2) For John does not say that Christ had gone to a wedding before the temptation, or that he had worked any of his miracles < before > he started preaching—except, perhaps, the ones he is said to have performed in play as a child. (3) (For he ought to have childhood miracles too, to deprive the other sects of an excuse for saying that "< the > Christ," meaning the dove, came to him after [his baptism in] the Jordan.[86] They say this because of the sum of the letters alpha and omega, which is [the same as the sum of the letters of] "dove," since the Savior said, "I am the Alpha and I am the Omega.")[87]

20,4 This is also why Luke represents Jesus, in his twelfth year, as having asked Mary, "Wist ye not that I must be in my Father's house?"[88] when she came looking for him, and he was engaged in dispute with the doctors at Jerusalem. (5) This refutes the argument of those who claim that he became the Son of God at the time of his baptism, when the dove, which they say is the Christ, came to him. And it makes it clear that the divine Word came from above and was made flesh of Mary at his coming, and

---

85 Clement of Alexandria says that John wrote a "spiritual" Gospel because the fleshly matters had already been reported, Eus. H. E. 6.14.7.

86 Iren. Haer. 1.14.6.

87 Rev 1:8.

88 Luke 2:49.

that the Spirit descended upon him in the Jordan, (6) to identify the One of whom the Father testified, "This is my Son, the Beloved, hear ye him."[89] It was also a sign, to those who would be enlightened in him, that they would be vouchsafed < the > gift of the Holy Spirit in baptism, and, by the grace he has given, the remission of their sins.

21,1 And then he began to work all his miracles, during the time of his preaching—< for > it says, "This *first* miracle did Jesus in Cana of Galilee."[90] (2) As I have said many times, this was not before the baptism. It was after his return from the temptation, the third day after the two days John's two disciples spent with him, the disciples who had heard [John] speak and followed Jesus. (3) Thus, immediately after the two days they spent with him, the Gospel adds, "And he went forth into Galilee and findeth Philip, and saith unto him, Follow me."[91]

21,4 Then immediately, on the third day there was a wedding in Cana of Galilee. Since there was a wedding just after he had left Judaea, he was rightly invited in its honor, as a blessing on marriage. (5) And it says, "On the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee, and the mother of Jesus was there, and both Jesus was called, and his disciples who were with him, to the marriage. (6) And when they wanted wine," it says, "The mother of Jesus saith, They have no wine. And Jesus saith unto her, Woman, what have I to do with thee? Mine hour is not yet come."[92]

21,7 < This took place* > after he came from the wilderness following the temptation, and after he had been taken to Jerusalem and had stood on the pinnacle of the temple, and had been borne from Jerusalem to a very high mountain which many say is Mt. Tabor, or Itarbion in translation; this mountain is in Galilee. (8) For Matthew, who said, "Jesus, hearing that John was cast into prison, departed into Galilee,"[93] assumed this order of events. (9) Now Luke, who also accurately described the departure from the mountain and spoke first of the mountain and the kingdoms the devil showed the Lord, mentions the pinnacle and Jerusalem later, and how Jesus returned to Galilee and Nazareth. And Matthew says in agreement with him, "Leaving Nazareth he went unto Capernaum."[94]

---

89 Matt 17:5.
90 John 2:11.
91 John 1:43.
92 John 2:1–4.
93 Cf. Matt 4:12.
94 Matt 4:13.

21,10 For he went to Nazareth and from there to the Jordan to visit John, and after crossing the Jordan betook himself to his boyhood home, to his mother at Nazareth, and stayed there (i.e., at the Jordan) for two days, at which time Andrew and the others also stayed with him. Then, for the salvation of mankind, he was moved to begin preaching; (11) and because he had come [there] after an interval he stayed two days, accompanied by the disciples he had taken by then. And dismissing the two who had followed him he went to Galilee at once, to preach and work the first miracle, the one he performed at the wedding.

21,12 For see how the wording assures < us > of this, when John the Baptist gives his testimony, and says as of an event already in the past, "And I *knew* him not, but he who *sent* me to baptize *said* unto me, Upon whom thou seest the Spirit descending in the form of a dove, the same is he."[95] (13) For when the Father sent John to baptize he granted him this sign, so that, when he saw it, he would recognize the Savior and Benefactor of our souls, who had been sent to the world from on high.

21,14 Sectarians like these are confounded by the truth and accuracy of the sacred scriptures, especially by the agreement of the four Gospels. No one in his right mind would reject the fully accurate account the Holy Spirit has given through the sacred Gospels. (15) For even though they say that the evangelists Matthew, Mark and Luke reported that the Savior was brought to the wilderness after his baptism, and that he spent forty days in temptation, and after the temptation heard of John's imprisonment and went to live at Capernaum by the sea—(16) but [then go on to say] that John is lying because he did not speak of this but straight off of the Savior's visit to John [the Baptist] and all the other things John says he did[96]—[even if this is their argument], their entire ignorance of the Gospels' exact words will be evident. (17) John the Evangelist indicates that *before* the arrest of John the Baptist the Lord went to him < again* > after the days of the temptation. If John had been imprisoned, how could the Savior still return to him at the Jordan?

21,18 Nor do they realize that the other three evangelists give an accurate account of the time after John's imprisonment by saying, "Jesus, hearing that John was cast into prison, departing from Nazareth dwelt in Capernaum which is on the seacoast."[97] And you see that everything is said in truthful agreement by the four evangelists.

---

[95] John 1:33.
[96] MSS λέγει; Holl's <διηγεῖται> λέγων appears unnecessary.
[97] Matt 4:14.

21,19 For John is plainly < following > the [other evangelists'] order when he says in turn that, after the Savior had performed the first miracle, gone to Capernaum and performed certain miracles there, and gone back to Nazareth and read the scroll, then finally, when John the Baptist was imprisoned, he went and lived at Capernaum for "not many days." (20) These are the "days" after the Epiphany, and after Christ's journey to Capernaum and Nazareth, his pilgrimage to Jerusalem for the Passover, and < his > return to John, where John was baptizing at Aenon < near > Salim. (21) For the Gospel says, "After this he went down to Capernaum, he and his mother and his brethren, and they remained there *not many days.*"[98] He was not yet telling us of Jesus' final residence [at Capernaum], of which he said later < that> *after* John's imprisonment he went to live at Capernaum by the sea.

21,22 "And the Passover of the Jews was nigh," as he says, "and Jesus went up to Jerusalem, and found the sellers of oxen, sheep and doves in the temple, and the changers of money sitting."[99] (23) And after expelling these money-changers and dove-sellers and the rest and saying, "Take these things hence and make not my Father's house an house of merchandise"—and after hearing their answer, "What sign showest thou us, seeing that thou doest these things?" and telling them, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up"[100]—(it was at this time that Nicodemus came to him)—and after saying a great deal, John says, (24) "Jesus came, and his disciples, to Judaea, and there he tarried with them and baptized. And John also was < baptizing > in Aenon near to Salim, for there was much water *there; for John was not yet cast into prison.*"[101]

21,25 And after John has said a great deal—"He that hath the bride is the bridegroom,"[102] [and so on]—the Gospel then says, "When therefore Jesus knew that the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples < than > John (though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples), he left Judaea and departed again into Galilee. (26) And he must needs pass through Samaria."[103] This was the occasion when he sat by the well and talked with the Samaritan woman. And the Samaritan woman told the townsmen about him, and the Samaritans came to him

98 John 2:12.
99 John 2:14.
100 John 2:16; 18–19.
101 John 3:22–24.
102 John 3:29.
103 John 4:1–4.

and begged him to stay with them, "and he stayed there two days, and many more believed because of his word."[104]

21,27 "Now after the two days he came into Galilee. And there was a certain nobleman whose son was sick at Capernaum."[105] This was when Jesus told him, "Go, thy son liveth,"[106] and he believed, and the boy was healed. And the Gospel says, "< This > is again the second miracle that Jesus did when he was come out of Judaea into Galilee."[107]

21,28 "After this there was a feast of the Jews"—I presume he is speaking of another feast of the Jews, Pentecost or Tabernacles—"and Jesus went up to Jerusalem."[108] This was when he came to the Sheep Pool on the Sabbath, and healed the paralytic who had been ill for thirty-eight years. (29) And after this, the acceptable year now being over, they began to persecute him, from the time when he healed the paralytic at the Sheep Pool on the Sabbath. John says in turn, The Jews persecuted Jesus the more, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but also said that God was his Father, making himself equal with God."[109] (30) How can the sects which make the Son inferior to the Father escape condemnation? "Making himself *equal* with God," says the Gospel.

21,31 "After these things Jesus went over the Sea of Galilee, which is the Sea of Tiberias, and a great multitude followed him because they saw the miracles which he did on them that were diseased. And Jesus went up into the mountain, and there he sat with his disciples. And the Passover, the feast of the Jews, was < nigh >."[110] (32) And now, as the other Gospels say, when John had been imprisoned Jesus came and made his home in Capernaum by the sea, as we find that John himself says in agreement with the others. For as the Passover comes in the month of March or April, it is perfectly plain that the times at which Jesus came to John after the temptation were different times [than this].

22,1 Again, they also accuse the holy evangelist—or rather, they accuse the Gospel itself—because, they say, "John said that the Savior kept two Passovers over a two-year period, but the other evangelists describe one Passover." (2) The boors do not even know that the Gospels not only

---

104 Cf. John 4:39–41.
105 John 4:46.
106 John 4:50.
107 John 4:54.
108 John 5:1.
109 John 5:18.
110 John 6:1–4.

acknowledge two Passovers as I have shown repeatedly, but that they speak of two earlier Passovers, and of that other Passover as well, on which the Savior suffered,—so that there are three Passovers, from the time of Christ's baptism and first preaching, over three years, until the cross.

22,3 For the Savior was born during the forty-second year of the Roman emperor Augustus—in the thirteenth consulship of the same Octavian Augustus and the consulship of Silanus, as the Roman consul lists indicate. (4) For these say as follows: "During their consulships," I mean Octavian's thirteenth and the consulship of Silanus, "Christ was born on the eighth before the Ides of January, thirteen days after the winter solstice and the increase of the light and the day."[111] (5) Greeks, I mean the idolaters, celebrate this day on the eighth before the Kalends of January, which Romans call Saturnalia, Egyptians Cronia, and Alexandrians, Cicellia. (6) For this division between signs of the zodiac, which is a solstice, comes on the eighth before the Kalends of January, and the day begins to lengthen because the light is receiving its increase. And it completes a period of thirteen days until the eighth before the Ides of January, the day of Christ's birth, with a thirtieth of an hour added to each day. (7) The Syrian sage, Ephrem, testified to this calculation in his commentaries when he said, "Thus the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ, his birth in the flesh or perfect incarnation which is called the Epiphany, was revealed after a space of thirteen days from the beginning of the increase of the light. For this too must needs be a type of the number of our Lord Jesus Christ and his twelve disciples, since, [added to the disciples], he made up < the > number of the thirteen days of the light's increase."[112]

22,8 And how many other things have been done and are being done because of, and in testimony to this calculation, I mean of Christ's birth? Indeed, those who guilefully preside over the cult of idols are obliged to confess a part of the truth, and in many places deceitfully celebrate a very great festival on the very night of the Epiphany, to deceive the idolaters who believe them into hoping[113] in the imposture and not seeking the truth.

22,9 First, at Alexandria, in the Coreum, as they call it; it is a very large temple, the shrine of Core. They stay up all night singing hymns to the

---

[111] Consularia Constantia, MHG Auct. Antiq. IX, 218. Here, however, the date given is the eighth before the Kalends of January, i.e., December 25.

[112] The passage is not extant.

[113] Achelis: ἐλπίσαντες. We prefer MSS: ἐλπίσαντας, in agreement with εἰδωλολάτρας.

idol with a flute accompaniment. And when they have concluded their nightlong vigil torchbearers descend into an underground shrine after cockcrow (10) and bring up a wooden image which is seated naked < on > a litter. It has a sign of the cross inlaid with gold on its forehead, two other such signs, [one] on each hand, and two other signs, [one] actually [on each of] its two knees—altogether five signs with a gold impress. And they carry the image itself seven times round the innermost shrine with flutes, tambourines and hymns, hold a feast, and take it back down to its place underground. And when you ask them what this mystery means they reply that today at this hour Core—that is, the virgin—gave birth to Aeon.

22,11 This is also done in the same way in the city of Petra, in the temple of the idol there. (Petra is the capital city of Arabia, the scriptural Edom.) They praise the virgin with hymns in the Arab language calling her, in Arabic, Chaamu—that is, Core, or virgin. And the child who is born of her they call Dusares, that is, "the Lord's only-begotten." And this is also done that night in the city of Elusa, as it is there in Petra, and in Alexandria.

22,12 I have been obliged to prove this with many examples because of those who do not believe that "The Epiphany" is a good name for the fleshly birth of the Savior, who was born at the eighth hour and *manifested*, by the angels' testimony, to the shepherds and the world—but he was *manifested* to Mary and Joseph as well. (13) And the star was *manifested* to the magi in the east at that hour, two years before their arrival at Jerusalem and Bethlehem, when Herod asked the magi themselves the precise time of the star's *manifestation*, and they told him it was no more than two years before. And this very word gave the Epiphany its name, from Herod's saying, "the *manifestation* of the star." (14) Thus when the magi said, "Where is he that is born king of the Jews? For we have seen his star in the east and are come to worship him,"[114] Herod saw that he had not been inquiring about the name of a merely human king.

22,15 For he mulled the matter over and was puzzled because many kings had been born in Jerusalem—Saul of the tribe of Benjamin first, David of the tribe of Judah second, David's son Solomon, Solomon's son Rehoboam, and Rehoboam's sons in succession—and no star had ever appeared at any of their births, and never, except this once, had magi arrived to come and worship the newborn king. And after giving this his consideration he attained to the knowledge of the truth as well, having

[114] Matt 2:2.

understood that this was not the sign of a man, but of the Lord alone. (16) Thus, when he asked the scribes and the priests, "Where is the Christ born?" and heard their answer, "in Bethlehem of Judaea,"[115] he was no longer asking about an earthly king or a mere man, but about Christ. And he learned the place by asking it of them, but the time by asking it of the magi.

22,17 For the magi themselves reached Bethlehem, after a two year interval, on this very day of the Epiphany, and offered their gifts, the myrrh, the gold and the frankincense. For the beginnings of many of the signs of Christ's manifestation came on this day of the Manifestation. (18) As I have said before and am obliged to say over and over, this was the day in the thirteenth consulship of Octavius Augustus and the consulship of Silanus [which fell] on the eighth before the Ides of January, thirteen days after the increase of the daylight. This lasts from the winter solstice, the eighth before the Kalends of January, until the actual day of Christ's birth and Manifestation, because of the type I spoke of—the Savior himself and his disciples, making thirteen.

22,19 Thus the Savior was born in the forty-second year of the Roman emperor Augustus in the consulship I have mentioned, twenty-nine years after Augustus' annexation of Judaea; Augustus had reigned for thirteen years before Judaea was finally annexed to Rome. (20) After Augustus' accession there was an alliance between the Romans and the Jews for about four years of his reign, with the dispatch of an auxiliary force, the appointment of a governor, and the payment of partial tribute to the Romans. < And again, partial tribute was given to the Romans* > for about five years [more], until Judaea was surrendered to them completely and became [fully] tributary to them, (21) because the rulers descended from Judah had come to an end, and Herod had been made king—a gentile, though indeed a proselyte. And then Christ was born in Bethlehem of Judaea and began to preach, after the last of the anointed rulers (χρίστοι) descended from Judah and Aaron had come to an end—(their line had continued until the anointed ruler Alexander, and Salina, or Alexandra.) This was the fulfillment of Jacob's prophecy, "There shall not fail a ruler from Judah and a governor from his loins, till he come for who it is prepared, and he is the expectation of the nations"[116]—a reference to the birth of the Lord.

---

[115] Cf. Matt 2:4–5.
[116] Gen 49:10.

22,22 All these things were accomplished beginning with Christ's birth in Bethlehem, in the forty-second year of the whole reign of Augustus. Augustus' forty-second year came after [the following]: The fifth year of the governorship of Herod's father Antipater, when there was an alliance between the Romans and the Jews and the payment of partial tribute; Antipater's governorship, from the sixth year of Augustus through his ninth year; Herod's appointment in Augustus' tenth year, and the payment of partial tribute until Augustus' thirteenth, which was the fourth year of the reign of his appointee, Herod; (23) the period from Herod's fourth year, which finally saw the complete surrender of Judaea, until Herod's thirty-third year, when Augustus had reigned for forty-two < and >, as I said, all Judaea had been subdued. [This came] after it had been tributary to the Romans for twenty-nine years; after Herod's father Antipater had been made governor; and after Herod had been made king of Judaea by Augustus in Augustus' tenth year.

22,24 1. These things (i.e., Christ's birth and the fulfillment of Jacob's prophecy) came about in the thirteenth consulship of Octavius Augustus and the consulship of Silanus, as I have often said. The consulships listed below succeeded that consulship in order, as follows.[117] [The consulships] of:

2. Lentulus and Piso
3. Lucius Caesar and Paulus
4. Vindicius and Varus
5. Lamius and Servilius Nonnius
6. Magnus Pompeius and Valerius
7. Lepidus and Aruncius
8. Caesar and Capito
9. Creticus and Nerva
10. Camillus and Quintillian
11. Camerus and Sabinus
12. Dolabella and Silanus
13. Lepidus and Taurus
14. Flaccus and Silanus
15. The two Sexti
16. Pompeius Magnus and Apuleius
17. Brutus and Flaccus

[117] Epiphanius' list of consuls is in close agreement with the Christian list given in the Consularia Constantia and the Chronicon Paschale, Monumenta Historiae Germanica Auctores Antiqua IX, 218–220 and XI 197–199.

18. Taurus and Libo
19. Crassus and Rufus
20. Tiberius Caesar for the second time, and Drusus Germanicus for the second time
21. Silanus and Balbus
22. Messala and Gratus
23. Tiberius Caesar for the third time, and Drusus Germanicus for the third time
24. Agrippa and Galba
25. Pollio and Veterus
26. Cethegus and Varus
27. Agrippa for the second time, and Lentulus Galba
28. Getulicus and Sabinus
29. Crassus and Piso
30. Silanus and Nerva

23,1 And you see that this is a period of thirty years. I have done my best to give an accurate list of the successive consulships, so that those who go over it will see that there is no falsehood in the sacred doctrine of the truth, but that everything has been proclaimed with accuracy by the church. (2) For who can count the successive consulships, which cannot be wrong, and not despise those who believe that there is a discrepancy in the number of the years which is celebrated by the evangelists?

23,3 This is also the downfall of the earlier Valentinian sect and certain others, with their fictitious record of the thirty aeons they thought they could compare with the years of the Savior's life, supposedly making it possible for them to record the myth of their aeons and first principles. (4) For in fact, it was in the *thirty-third* year of his incarnation that the Only-begotten suffered for us—the divine Word from on high who was impassible, and yet < took > flesh < and > suffered for us to cancel our sentence of death. (5) For after that consulship which came, as I indicated, in Christ's thirtieth year, there was another, called the consulship of Rufus and Rubellio. And then, at the beginning of the consulship after the consulship < of Rufus and > Rubellio—the one which later came to be called the consulship of Vinnicius and Longinus Cassius—the Savior accepted suffering on the thirteenth before the Kalends of April < in his thirty-third *year*, which was* > the eighteenth year of Tiberius Caesar. (6) And this confounds the deceit of all these sectarians. The accurate teaching is plainly that the Gospels contain not only two periods before a festival of the Passover, but even three.

24,1 For Christ was born in the month of January, that is, on the eighth before the Ides of January—in the Roman calendar this is the evening of January fifth, at the beginning of January sixth. In the Egyptian calendar it is the eleventh of Tybi. In the Syrian or Greek it is the sixth of Audynaeus. In the Cypriote or Salaminian it is the fifth day of the fifth month. In the Paphian it is the fourteenth of July. In the Arabian it is the twenty-first of Aleom. < In the Macedonian it is the sixteenth of Apellaeus. >[118] In the Cappadocian it is the thirteenth of Atartes. In the Athenian it is the fifth of Maemacterium. And in the Hebrew calendar it is the fifth of Tebeth. (2) For in this case too the prophet's oracle had to be fulfilled, "There came unto us the ark of the Lord"—but he means Christ's perfect manhood—"on the fifth day of the fifth month."[119] (3) This had to be fulfilled first by the Hebrew reckoning, by the following of which many of the gentiles, I mean the Romans, observe the fifth day in the evening preceding the sixth. But the Cypriotes keep the fifth of the month itself; and the native Egyptians, and the Salaminians, observe that month as the fifth, just as the Hebrews make it the fifth month from their New Year.

24,4 Christ had lived through these twenty-nine full consulships, but in the thirtieth consulship, I mean < the consulship of Silanus and Nerva* >, he came to John in about the < eleventh > month, and was baptized in the river Jordan in the thirtieth year following his birth in the flesh, (5) on the sixth before the Ides of November. That is, he was baptized on the twelfth of the Egyptian month Athyr, the eighth of the Greek month of Dius, the sixth of third Choiak in the Salaminian, or Constantian calendar, the sixteenth of Apogonicus in the Paphian, the twenty-second of Angalthabaith in the Arabian, the sixteenth of Apellaeus in the Macedonian, the fifteenth of Aratates in the Cappadocian, the seventh of Metagitnium in the Athenian, and the seventh of Marcheshvan in the Hebrew. (6) As I have often remarked, the holy Gospel according to Luke bears me out with some such words as, "Jesus began to be about thirty years old, being, as was supposed, the son of Joseph."[120]

24,7 From this day, the twelfth of Athyr, he "preached the acceptable year of the Lord" as had been foretold in the prophet Isaiah: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, for the Lord hath anointed me to preach the Gospel

---

118 Klostermann's restoration, based on 24,5.
119 This may be a faultily remembered version of Zech 7:3.
120 Luke 3:23.

to the poor. He hath sent me to proclaim liberty to captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord and the day of retribution."[121]

25,1 For he indeed preached an acceptable year of the Lord, that is, a year without opposition. He preached for the first year after < the > thirtieth year of his incarnation, and everyone accepted his preaching. Neither Jews nor gentiles nor Samaritans disputed it; all were glad to hear him. (2) In this year he went up to Jerusalem, after being baptized and passing the forty days of the temptation, and the twenty days prior to the first miracle, which I have spoken of, and the choosing of his disciples. (3) It is plain that, after returning to the Jordan from the temptation, and crossing the Sea of Tiberias and going to Nazareth, he went up to Jerusalem and, midway through the feast, cried out, "If anyone thirst, let him come to me and drink."[122] And then he went to Nazareth, Judaea, Samaria and Tyre.

25,4 And at the close of the first year he went up to Jerusalem again, and now they tried to arrest him during the feast and were afraid to; at this feast he said, "I go not up at this feast."[123] (5) He was not lying, never fear! It says, "He set out midway through the festival and went up to Jerusalem,[124] and they said, Is not this he whom they sought to arrest? And lo, he speaketh boldly. Have the priests, then, learned that this is the Christ?"[125] (6) For because he was speaking mysteriously with his brethren, and in supernatural terms, they did not know what he meant. He was telling them that he would not go up to heaven at that feast, or go to the cross then to accomplish the work of the passion and the mystery of redemption, and rise from the dead and ascend to heaven. All these things he accomplished at his own discretion.

25,7 And finally after this, at the close of the two year period which followed his baptism and his birthday, in November [for the former] and January [for the latter]—in the thirty-third year of his incarnation, after living through the two consulships I have mentioned, those of the two Gemini and of Rufus and Rubellio, (8) the impassible divine Word accomplished the mystery of his passion in the third consulship, in its third month, in March after January. He suffered in the flesh for us while

---

121 Cf. Isa 61:1–2; Luke 4:18–19.
122 John 7:14; 37.
123 John 7:8.
124 John 7:14.
125 Cf. John 7:25–27.

retaining his impassibility, as Peter says, "being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit."[126]

26,1 Jesus suffered on the thirteenth before the Kalends of April, the Jews meanwhile having skipped one evening, that is, at midnight on the fourteenth of the month.[127] (2) For the Jews came ahead of time and ate the Passover, as the Gospel says[128] and I have often remarked. They thus ate the Passover two days before its < proper* > eating; that is, they ate it in the evening on the third day of the week, a thing that ought to be done at evening on the fifth day.[129] For on that basis[130] the fourteenth of the month was the fifth day of the week, [when the Passover should have been eaten].

26,3 But Jesus was arrested late on that same third day, which was the nighttime of the eleventh of the month, the sixteenth before the Kalends of April.[131] The dawning of the fourth day[132] of the week was the nighttime of the [Jewish] twelfth day of the month, the fifteenth before the Kalends of April. The daytime of the thirteenth day of the month[133] was the fifth day of the week, but the [ensuing] nighttime was the fourteenth of the month, the fourteenth before the Kalends of April.[134] The daytime of the fourteenth of the month was the eve of the Sabbath, the

---

126 1 Pet. 3:17.

127 Following Strobel's understanding (pp. 305–309) of the situation envisaged by Epiphanius, and reading the text without Holl's restorations. Epiphanius seems to have believed that the Jews, as a calendar correction, dropped the six hours between 6pm and midnight on the Jewish fifth day of the week, our Thursday night. Following this alleged calendar correction the Jewish fifth day of the week, and the days following, would begin at midnight, Roman fashion, rather than in the Jewish manner, at nightfall. The resurrection would then be dated at the midnight between the equinox and the day of the equinox, not only by the Roman calendar but also by the now corrected Jewish calendar.

Not only Holl, but others scholars emend or restore Epiphanius to make his work correct. Strobel keeps Epiphanius' text, on the assumption that the position he takes is artificial, and intended to reconcile Quartodecimans to the Easter decision of Nicaea.

128 Epiphanius means Matt. 26:2.

129 Cf. Didascalia 21 (Achelis-Flemming p. 111; Stewart-Sykes p. 214).

130 I.e., οὕτως, if all had been done right.

131 Cf. Didascalia 21 (Achelis-Flemming p. 111; Stewart-Sykes p. 214). In other words, Jesus was arrested on our Tuesday night. However, the "nighttime of the eleventh of the month" should mean Wednesday night; Epiphanius, or the text, is confused here. Epiphanius might have read the phrase, "late on the third day," in his version of the Didascalia, and taken it as synonymous with "nighttime of the eleventh" (Schmidt, p. 691).

132 I.e., the period between 6pm and midnight on our Wednesday.

133 I.e., 6am–6pm on our Thursday.

134 I.e., the calendar correction has now been made, and the Jewish 14 Nisan now begins at midnight on the Roman thirteenth before the Kalends, our Friday.

thirteenth before the Kalends of April. The daytime of the fifteenth of the month[135] was the Sabbath, the twelfth before the Kalends of April.

26,4 The dawning of the Lord's Day was [the end of] the nighttime of the fifteenth of the month.[136] That was the illumination of hades, earth and heaven and the < time of the equality > the night and the day, reckoned [both] because of the (Jewish] fifteenth of the month and because of the course of the sun; for the resurrection and the equinox < came > [at midnight] on the eleventh before the Kalends of April. As I said, < the Jews > were mistaken about this, and made sure that one day was skipped.[137]

26,5 Now the exact computation [of the lunar year] contains some [double-] hours,[138] and comes out even every third year, making a difference of one day in their calculations. (6) For they add four other [double-] hours per year to the moon's course after its 354 days, making one [additional] day every three years. (7) And so they intercalate five months in fourteen years because the one [double-]hour is subtracted from the sun's course of 365 days and three [double-] hours; for, with the hours added, the final result is 365 days less one [double]-hour.

26,8 And so, because they multiply the fourteen years by six every eighty-four years, they intercalate one month in the eighty-fifth year, so that there are thirty-one [intercalary] months every eighty-five years; but by exact reckoning there ought to be thirty-one months, twenty-four[139] days, and three [double]-hours. (27,1) The Jews were wrong at that time for this reason; not only did they eat the Passover two days early because they were disturbed, but they also added the one day they had skipped, since they were mistaken in every way. But the revelation of the truth has done everything for our salvation with the utmost precision. (2) Thus when the Savior himself had finished the Passover he went out into the mount "with intense desire"[140] after eating it. (3) And yet he ate that Jewish Passover

---

135 In accordance with the calendar correction, the Jewish 14 Nisan now begins at midnight on the Roman thirteenth before the Kalends, our Friday.

136 In accordance with the calendar correction, the Jewish 15 Nisan now ends at midnight on the Roman fifteenth before the Kalends, our Saturday/Sunday.

137 According to 26,1, this should be "one evening," i.e., nighttime. Epiphanius has erred, is speaking loosely, or misunderstands the Didascalia, see note 131.

138 The following explains, in some sense, both the calendar correction and the eating of the Passover in advance. Without these, the moment of the equinox would have been midnight on the 16 Nisan, not coincident with the equinox. For discussion, see Strobel.

139 Strobel and Codex Urbinas: κδ; Codex Marcianus Venetus: κα; Strobel suggests that both are mistranscriptions of an original κϝ.

140 Luke 22:15; I.e., desire to eat the real Passover.

with the disciples, and did nothing different. He himself kept it the same as the others, so as not to destroy the Law but to fulfill it.

27,4 And so, after completing his thirtieth year in which he was baptized, and after completing his thirty-first by preaching for an entire "acceptable year" without opposition, but [then] preaching another year with opposition, to the accompaniment of persecution and hatred; and after completing [part of] another year after it,[141] a full seventy-four days from his birthday,—(the Epiphany, (5) January 5 at the dawn of January 6 and the eleventh of the Egyptian month Tybi)—until the thirteenth before the Kalends of April, as I said, < on that same thirteenth before the Kalends of April*, > the twenty-fourth of the Egyptian month Phamenoth, he had attained a full thirty-two years, plus seventy-four days from the Epiphany. (6) And he rose on the twenty-sixth of the Egyptian month Phamenoth—(this was the day after the equinox and was preceded by the night and the equinox)—the day which followed the twenty-fifth of Phamenoth, the eleventh before the Kalends of April, < and appeared to his disciples. > This makes liars of all who are not sons of the truth.

28,1 Valentinus, first of all, is at once < exposed > as a fantasist, since he expects < to prove* > to us, from the years of the Savior's rearing and coming to manhood, that there are thirty aeons. He does not realize that the Savior did not live for only thirty years. (2) He was baptized in his thirtieth year at the age of twenty-nine years and ten months, on the twelfth of Athyr, as I said, the sixth before the Ides of November. And then, following his baptism which was < sixty days > before his birthday, < he passed* > an acceptable year of the Lord in preaching, and another year, of opposition, after < the first* > year,[142] and [finally] seventy-four days of opposition. (3) Thus all the years of his incarnation, from his birth until his passion, amounted to thirty-two years and seventy-four days. But there were two years and 134 days (sic!)[143] from the start < of his preaching in* > the consulship of Silanus and Nerva. And Valentinus stands refuted, and the many who are as foolish as he.

28,4 The ones who reject John's Gospel have also been refuted. (I may rightly call them "Dumb," since they reject the Word of God—the Father's Word who was proclaimed by John, and who came down from heaven and wrought salvation for us < by > the whole of his advent in the flesh.)

---

[141] Klostermann μετ' αὐτὸν, MSS and Holl μετὰ τοῦτο.
[142] Holl μετὰ τὸν πρῶτοϋ ἐνιαυτον, Klostermann μετὰ τοῦτο.
[143] This should be two years and 14 days. Cf. 16,1–9.

(5) For from the consulships, the years, the witness of the prophet Isaiah, the Gospel according to Luke, the Gospel according to John, the Gospel according to Matthew, the Gospel according to Mark—in short, the misguided people have been refuted from every source, (6) since Christ did not live to see just one Passover over the period of a year from the start of his preaching, but actually lived through the periods of a little less than three consulships after his baptism by John. (7) And the nitwits' fallacious argument has failed < because it is* > full of silliness, and of an ignorance that not only fails to recognize its own salvation, but even futilely makes a lying war on the truth.

29,1 For I have also found it written somewhere < in > these works that the Word of God was born about the fortieth year of Augustus. This was the writer's error, or else he wrote only "forty (μ) years" because the figure "beta" had been erased and only the "mu" was left on the page. For Christ was born in the forty-second year of Augustus.

29,2 And it says that Christ < was conceived > on the twelfth before the Kalends of July or June—I cannot say which—in the consulship of Sulpicius Cammarinus and Betteus Pompeianus.[144] (3) I have noticed < too > that those who have given a date for the conception, and Gabriel's bringing of the tidings to the Virgin, have said < this because of > a supposition of certain persons who have it by tradition[145] that Christ was born after a term of seven months. (4) For I have found that there is a time of seven lunar months less four days between the month they mention[146] and the eleventh of Tybi, the eighth before the Ides of January, when, in fact, the Epiphany came and Christ was born. (5) So if you should find < this > in a marginal gloss somewhere, do not be misled by the information. The actual date of Christ's birth is in fact the eleventh of Tybi.

29,6 Some, however, say that Christ was carried in the womb for ten months less fourteen days and eight hours, making nine months, fifteen days and four hours. They are alluding to Solomon's saying, "compacted in blood for a time of ten months."[147]

29,7 In any case, < it has been shown > by every means < that > the Lord's birth in the flesh took place on < the > eleventh of the Egyptian

---

144 This name is inaccurate and is ungrammatically placed in the dative while Sulpicius Cammarinus is in the genitive; it may be interpolated (Strobel, Dummer).

145 Holl ἐχόντων ἐν παραδώσει, MSS λεγόντων ἐν παραδώσει.

146 Holl προειρημένου μηνός, MSS προπόσων.

147 Wisd Sol 7:2.

month Tybi. And the first miracle in Cana of Galilee, when the water was made wine, was performed on about the same eleventh day thirty years later. (30,1) And even to this day this happens in many places as a testimony to unbelievers because of the miracle which was wrought at that time, as streams and rivers in many localities testify by being changed to wine. (2) The stream at Cibyre, the chief city of Caria, [bears witness] at the same time of day at which the servants drew the water and Christ said, "Give it to the governor of the feast."[148] And the stream at Gerasa in Arabia testifies in the same way. < I > have drunk from the < one at > Cibyre < myself >, and my brethren have drunk from the stream in the martyrium at Gerasa. (3) And in Egypt too many give this testimony of the Nile. Thus in Egypt itself, and in many countries, everyone draws water on the eleventh of the Egyptian month Tybi, and stores it up.

30,4 And so we see that after the twelfth of Athyr, when he had gone away and been tempted for forty days, and [then] come to Nazareth and stayed there for about two weeks and three days, he [next] went down to the Jordan to see John and spent a first day there, and a second; and [then he] returned to Nazareth, and likewise stayed there for a first and a second day. (5) And on the third day he went to Cana of Galilee. This makes a total of sixty days after the baptism: the forty days of the temptation; the two weeks < and two days > at Nazareth, and the other two; and on the third day the miracle of the water was performed at the wedding.[149]

30,6 After that he came to Capernaum and performed other miracles as I have said many times, and [then] returned to Nazareth again and read the roll of Isaiah the prophet. This is why [the people of Nazareth] say, "Do also here whatsoever signs we have heard thou hast done in Capernaum."[150] (7) Later, again, he returned from there to Capernaum and from there went over to the Lake, or Sea of Gennesareth, and Peter and the others were chosen for good; and then he went on to do all of his preaching.

30,8 For going in order, as I said: after the forty < days > [of the temptation], and the other two weeks and two days < at Nazareth >, Christ went to John on a first day and the day following. And when he had started back to Nazareth < from > John, and remained [in lodging] from the tenth hour until evening, and on the next day gone out and met Philip (9)—making two days—the Gospel next shows its unshakeable accuracy by its men-

148 John 2:8.
149 Cf. the material at 16,3; 21,10; 30,8.
150 Luke 4:23.

tion of the first two, the ones on which he "remained" in the course of his journey, [and] by saying [next], "On the *third* day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee."[151]

30,10 This was symbolic of the church. For on the third day of his activity in the heart of the earth, which he spent in hades[152] after the passion, he arose and contracted marriage with "Cana"—for "Cana" means "the bride."[153] (11) But who is "the bride" except the heiress of whom the Psalmist said, "For the heiress,"[154] and so on, in the fifth Psalm? Blessed indeed is this marriage, which took its occasion from that type! (12) For there was an actual wedding there, in Cana of Galilee, and water which really became wine, < and Christ* > was invited for two purposes. [One was] to dry, < through > marriage, the wetness of the world's carousers to temperance and decency. [The other was] to remedy what is wanting for good spirits through cheering wine, and through grace. (13) He thus completely silences the opponents of marriage,[155] and by providing the vine with water, and tinting it into wine within the vine to make men glad, shows that, with his Father and Holy Spirit, he is God. I have discussed this elsewhere at greater length;[156] here I have hurried over the matter as though in passing.

30,14 At all events, the Savior kept two Passovers after the beginning of his preaching and suffered on the third, and this ends the things I have by now said in great detail about days, months and consulships. And their erroneous argument has failed in every respect, since the Gospels are in agreement and no evangelist contradicts another.

31,1 But to return to the subject. To witness to what I have said in a number of different ways, Luke, again, says, "It came to pass on the second Sabbath after the first."[157] This is to show that a "first Sabbath" is the Sabbath the Lord ordained at the beginning and called a Sabbath during the creation, a Sabbath which has recurred at seven day intervals from then till now—but that a "second" Sabbath is the one instituted by the Law. (2) For the Law says, "Thou shalt take to thyself a lamb of a year old, male and without blemish"—a type of the Savior—"on the tenth day of

151 John 2:1.
152 Holl ἐν τῷ ἅδῃ, MSS ἐν τῇ γῇ.
153 So Origen, In Joh. 13.62.
154 Ps 5, superscription.
155 Holl γάμου, MSS κυρίου, Codex Urbinas νόμου κυρίου.
156 Anc. 66,2–10.
157 Luke 6:1.

the month, and it shall be kept until the fourteenth day. And ye shall slay it at even on the fourteenth day; and it shall be unto thee a Sabbath, an holy day, and ye shall eat unleavened bread seven days, and the seventh day thou shalt declare holy."[158] (3) And see how such a holy day of the lamb is called a second Sabbath after the first Sabbath, and is consecrated as a Sabbath even if it may be the Lord's Day, or if the second day of the week, or the third day of the week falls upon it. (4) But a second Sabbath [after this one], if it recurs in the regular seven day cycle, is called a "first" Sabbath—all of which shows that not only John gave indication of a time of two years and three Passover festivals, but that Luke and the others did as well.

31,5 For the Law says as follows: "Thou shalt number unto thee seven weeks from the first [reaping] of the sheaf, the putting of the sickle unto the standing corn, and thou shalt declare the seventh seventh day an holy day of the Lord,"[159] meaning the feast of Pentecost. (6) For within three days after the slaying of the Passover—that is, three days after [the sacrifice of] the lamb—the Law enjoined the bringing in of the sheaf, meaning the blessed Sheaf which was raised from the dead after the third day. (7) For the earth brought forth the Sheaf, and he received it back from her at his rising < from > the tomb and remaining with his disciples for the forty days, and at the end of the Pentecost bringing it into the heavens to the Father. (8) He is the firstborn of the firstborn, the holy firstfruits, the Sheaf which was reaped from Mary, the Embrace embraced in God, the fruit of the womb, the firstfruits of the threshing floor. (9) For after Pentecost the sickle no longer offers a firstfruits to God: "The Lord dieth no more, death hath no more dominion over him."[160] as the scripture says.

31,10 And you see how many of God's mysteries the Law prefigured and the Gospel fulfilled. In which passages can I not expound them? But not to go on too long, I must return to our order of presentation. (11) However, from the ears, the standing grain and the disciples, it is plain that John, Luke and all the evangelists describe all these things *after* the forty day temptation.

32,1 But again, these people are not ashamed to take arms against the things St. John has said, supposing that they can overthrow the truth, but unaware that they are attacking themselves rather than the sound doc-

158 Exod 12:5; 6:14; 15.
159 Deut 16:9; Lev 23:15–16.
160 Rom 6:9.

trine. (2) For they derisively say against Revelation, "What good does John's Revelation do me by telling me about seven angels and seven trumpets?" (3) not knowing that such things were essential and profitable when the message was rightly understood.

32,4 For whatever was obscure and puzzling in The Law and the Prophets, the Lord in his providence revealed by the Holy Spirit "to his servant John"[161] for our salvation. What was obscure there he proclaims spiritually and clearly here, < for he gave commandments bodily* > in the Law but reveals the same ones spiritually to us.

(5) And in the Law he makes the then tabernacle out of skins, the skins that were dyed scarlet, blue and so on, to show that the tabernacle there is actually a tent, but that it awaits the perfect Tabernacle of Christ. (6) For skin comes off a body and is a dead thing, like the shadow of a living body; and this shows that bodies are God's tabernacle, for God dwells in holy bodies in fulfillment of the words of scripture, "I shall tabernacle in thee and make my abode in thee."[162]

32,7 Thus error would arise among the faithful if the book had not been revealed to us spiritually, teaching us that there is no need for trumpets, but < enabling us* > to know that God's entire activity is spiritual—(8) so that we will not take these as bronze or silver trumpets like the Jewish trumpets, but understand spiritually that they are the church's message from heaven: as he has said elsewhere, "On that day they sound with the great trumpet."[163] (9) For the prophets were trumpets, but the great Trumpet is the Lord's holy voice in the Gospel. For this is why angels were also privileged to make revelations to us; "For the trumpet shall sound," it says, "and the dead will arise."[164]

32,10 But if you people joke about the angels' trumpets because of their being in Revelation, then the trumpet the holy apostle speaks of must be a joke too, for he says, "The Lord shall descend from heaven at the last trump, and the dead will arise on the last day at the voice of the archangel."[165] (11) What reply is left you, since Paul agrees with the holy apostle John in the Revelation? How can every error not be refuted at once, when God has testified < for > the saints in each book?

---

161 Rev 1:1.
162 2 Cor 6:16 (Lev 26:12).
163 Cf. Num 10:10.
164 1 Cor 15:52.
165 Cf. 1 Thes 4:16.

33,1 Then again, some of them seize on the following text in Revelation, and say in contradiction of it, "He said, in turn, 'Write to the angel of the church in Thyatira,'[166] and there is no church of Christians in Thyatira. How could he write to a non-existent church?" (2) In fact these people demolish themselves since they are compelled by their own declarations[167] to confess the truth. For if they say, "There is no church in Thyatira now," they are showing that John has foretold this.

33,3 For after these Phrygians had settled there and like wolves seized the minds of the simple believers, they converted the whole town to their sect, and at that time those who reject Revelation attacked this text in an effort to discredit it. (4) But now, in our time, the church is there thanks to Christ and is growing, 112 years after [its restoration], even < though > there are some others (i.e., sectarians) there. Then, however, the whole church had deserted to the Phrygians. (5) And thus the Holy Spirit was at pains to reveal to us the way the church would fall into error ninety-three years after the time of the apostles, John and his successors—or in other words, for a time < of 138 years* > from the Savior's ascension until the church's restoration—since the church there would go astray and be buried in the Phrygian sect.

33,6 For this is how the Lord at once confounds < them > in Revelation, with the words, "Write to the angel of the church in Thyatira, Thus saith he whose eyes are as a flame of fire, and his feet like fine brass. I know thy works, and thy faith and thy love and thy ministry, and that thy latter works are more than the first. (7) But I have against thee that thou sufferest the woman Jezebel to deceive my servants, calling herself a prophetess, teaching to eat things sacrificed to idols and commit fornication. And I gave her space for repentance, and she will not repent of her fornication."[168]

33,8 Don't you see, you people, that he means the women who are deceived by a false conception of prophecy, and will deceive many? I mean that he is speaking of Priscilla, Maximilla and Quintilla, (9) whose imposture the Holy Spirit did not overlook. He foretold it prophetically by the mouth of St. John, who prophesied before his falling asleep, during the time of Claudius Caesar and earlier, when he was on the isle of Patmos. Even these people in Thyatira admit that this has come true.

---

166 Rev 2:18.
167 Holl ἀνασκευάζοντες, ἀνασκευαζόμενοι, MSS: ἀναγκάζοντες.
168 Rev 2:18–21.

(10) John, then, was writing prophetically, to those who were living in Christ there at the time, that a woman would call herself a prophetess. And the artificial argument which is raised against the truth has failed completely, since it can be shown that the prophetic oracle in Revelation is truly of the Holy Spirit.

34,1 Again, in their endless hunt for texts, to give the appearance of discrediting the holy apostle's books—I mean John's Gospel and Revelation and perhaps the Epistles as well, for they too agree with the Gospel and Revelation—these people get excited (2) and quote, "I saw, and he said to the angel, Loose the four angels which are upon the Euphrates. And I heard the number of the host, ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands, and they were clad in breastplates of fire and sulfur and hyacinth."[169]

34,3 For people like these thought that the truth might be < some sort of > joke. For if he speaks of the four angels who are sitting in the Euphrates, this is to indicate the various peoples there who live by the Euphrates: the Assyrians, Babylonians, Medes and Persians. (4) For these are the four kingdoms which are successively mentioned in Daniel. The Assyrians were the first of them to rule, and in Daniel's time, the Babylonians. But the Medes succeeded them, and after them came the Persians, whose first king was Cyrus.

34,5 For the nations have been put under the angels' command, as God's holy servant Moses testifies, interpreting the words consistently and saying: "Ask thy father and he will tell thee, thine elders and they will say it unto thee: when the most High apportioned the nations, when he dispersed the sons of Adam, he set bounds to the nations according to the number of the angels of God. And his people Jacob became the Lord's portion, Israel the lot of his inheritance."[170] (6) Now if the nations have been put under the angels' command John was right in saying, "Loose the four angels who are upon the Euphrates." They are plainly in charge [of the nations], and prevented from sending the nations to war until the time of [the end of] God's long-suffering, until he orders the avenging of his saints by their agency. (7) The angels in command are restrained by the Spirit and not allowed to attack, because justice does not release them yet, so that the rest of the nations may be released because of the outrage the saints have endured. But they are to be released and fall suddenly on the

169 Rev 9:14; 16; 17.
170 Deut 32:7–9.

earth, as John and the rest of the prophets foretold. For when the angels are aroused, they arouse the nations to an avenging onslaught.

34,8 And let no one doubt that he meant sulfur, fiery and hyacinth breastplates. Those nations wear clothing of that color. "Sulfur clothes" means a quince yellow color, as they call it, of wool. "Fiery" means their scarlet clothing, and "hyacinth" means the blue-green wool.

35,1 But since these people have not received the Holy Spirit they are spiritually condemned for not understanding the things of the Spirit, and choosing to speak against the words of the Spirit. This is because they do not know the gifts of grace in the holy church, which the Holy Spirit, the holy apostles, and the holy prophets have expounded truly and soundly, with understanding and a sound mind. (2) One of the apostles and prophets, St. John, has shared his sacred gift with the holy church, through the Gospel, the Epistles and the Revelation. (3) But these people are liable to the scriptural penalty, "Whoso blasphemeth against the Holy Spirit it will not be forgiven him, neither in this world nor in the world to come."[171] For they have gone to war against the words the Spirit has spoken.

35,4 But let us go on once more to the rest, beloved, with the power of God. Now that I have said such things, and so many of them, against such a sect, I think that this is enough. I have trampled it with God's power and truth, like the many-footed millipede or the serpent they call the woodlouse. It is not very strong and its poison is not very painful, but it has lots of feet and its body is long and twisty.

Against Adamians[1] *32, but 52 of the series*

1,1 The four-footed animal with an underground den which tunnels in the earth and has its burrow deep inside it, is called a mole. All its characteristics are like those of a small puppy for it has the < same > round shape, and it has no sight at all. (2) It is a destructive creature which roots out people's crops from below, especially every cucumber bed and the sharp-tasting plants—onions, garlic, purse-tassels and the like—and lilies and the rest. (3) But if it actually gets onto the surface during its tunneling, in the open air, or if it is hunted and caught by men, it is an object of ridicule to everyone who hunts the creature.

---

[171] Matt 12:32.

[1] This sect is reported only by Epiphanius, and by Theodoret (Haer. Fab. 1.6) in dependence upon Epiphanius. Epiphanius' sources are oral, cf. 1,6–9.

1,4 With all this I am trying to say of the sect with which I now have to do that it is blind in heart and stupid, creates desolation for itself and undermines the ground it stands on, and injures the roots of many, < I mean > of those who have happened on it. (5) But if it should be spied by the wise, it gives them a good laugh. As the creature we spoke of is mocked for its blindness, < and > cannot find its hole because of its lack of sight, so is this sect.

1,6 For they have adopted the name of Adam. I say this because I have heard it reported by many; I have not found it in any treatises, and have certainly not met any such people. (7) And so, since many have spoken of the sect, I consider it worth mentioning. And this is why I was right in comparing it with that blind animal which is not readily seen by men; it is hidden in the earth and does its damage below.

1,8 Now it is completely absurd and I considered not including it at all. However, as long as there is even a rumor of it, it can do the wise hearer no harm to know about all the tares the devil has sown in the world. (9) For whether or not there is such a sect, since I have heard many say that there is I think it is sensible to speak of it for safety's sake and not leave it out, even if it has been dissolved and is no longer in being. For I am not certain whether it still exists or not.

1,10 But why should I spend a long time on my prologue to the description of it? I shall begin my account of the ridicule, or rather, of the sorrow. For it is susceptible of the two things at once, ridicule and sorrow—< sorrow > at the devil's way of planting contempt for God's creature in the human mind; ridicule of those who can neither see, nor conceive of anything sensible.

2,1 In the first place, they say that these people build their churches—or dens and caves; that is what I would call the meetings of the sects—in heated rooms, and that they heat them from below so that there will be hot air to warm the congregation in the chamber inside. (2) And when they come in they have people to watch the clothes, like cloak-room attendants, stationed at the doors. And they each, whether man or woman, undress outside as they come in, and enter with their whole bodies as naked as the day they were born. And their recognized leaders and teachers all sit stark naked, some in front and some in back, here and there in no particular order.

2,3 They are all called "continent," if you please, and make a boast of it—and "virgins," as they delude themselves into thinking they are—and they have their readings and all the rest of their service naked. (4) But if it appears that one of them has "fallen into transgression," as they put it,

they do not admit him any more. They say that he < is > Adam after eating from the tree, and condemn him to expulsion from their church as though from Paradise. For they think that their church is Paradise, and that they themselves are Adam and Eve.

2,5 Why do they heat the room, then—to keep from getting a chill? Adam and Eve didn't live in a house with a furnace and weren't oppressed by any heat, and no cold afflicted them. (6) They had the purest of air, temperately dispensed to them by God < with > all mildness, neither sharpened by the rigor of cold, nor enervated by summer's wretched heat. The country had been set aside for an immortal abode, very < well > made by God, filled with gladness and well-being; and as I said, it got neither cold nor hot. Since the Adamians lack these things, it is plain that they are a joke.

3,1 Next let us look at another way of exposing their whole imposture. Adam and Eve were not naked for one hour; they were always naked "and were not ashamed."[2] But the nakedness of these people is not from lack of shame, even if they themselves think so; they are naked for the sake of an insatiable pleasure which works its enchantment on the pupils of the eyes. (2) The modesty commended in all the sacred scriptures has been taken from them and the words of the prophet are truly fulfilled, "The appearance of an harlot hath been given thee, who hast been shameless with all."[3]

3,3 But after that hour they resume their clothes outside, and [so] they cannot be Adam. Adam and his wife were not furnished clothing at the outset. They sewed fig leaves together first, and then they were given skin tunics, and so, after a considerable part of their lives, "the manifold wisdom of God"[4] endowed them with the knowledge of clothing.

3,4 These people will also be jeered at in every way because, in calling themselves Adam and Eve, they are lying about themselves, and yet at the same time telling the truth. (5) For it is plain from many indications that they are not Adam, as I have shown. But that they are mocked by the spiritual serpent is plain from their false symbolism, their nakedness, shame and absurdity.

3,6 It is not worth my while to make a big thing of their refutation. To kill a beast of their sort one does not need weapons of war or heavy

---

[2] Gen 2:25.
[3] Jer 3:3.
[4] Cf. Eph 3:10.

armor; (7) it is dispatched with a little stick. Often, when it has been pulled from its den it is merely left alone and dies of itself, laughed and jeered at with nowhere to run to—as these people, when they are caught, are put to shame by their ridiculous absurdity, unseemly behavior and silly religion.

3,8 But now, as we prepare to look into the rest, let us pray the Lord once more for his assistance in finding out the rest and refuting them, and for our salvation and that of our readers.

Against Sampsaeans[1]

1,1 There is a sect of Peraean Sampsaeans, the people also known as Elkasaites whom I have already mentioned in my other Sects,[2] in the country called Peraea beyond the Salt, or as it is called, the Dead Sea. They are < also > in Moabitis near the river Arnon, and on the other side in Ituraea and Naabatitis, as I have often said of them.[3]

1,2 These people boast that Elxai is their teacher, and further, two women of his stock who are alive to this day, and are worshipped as supposed goddesses because they are of the blessed seed. (3) But Ossaeans, Ebionites and Nazoraeans use this book, as I have often said.[4] These Sampsaeans, however, actually base their religion on it, and are neither Christians, Jews nor pagans; since they are just in the middle, they are nothing. But they say that they have another book, which is called the book of Elxai's brother Iexai.

1,4 They say that God is one, and supposedly worship him by the administration of some sort of baptisms.[5] They are devoted to the Jewish religion, [but] not in all ways. Some of them even abstain from meat.

1,5 They will die for Elxai's descendants. And I have heard recently that the one woman, called Marthus, had died though, unless she has died too, Marthana was still alive. (6) Any time these women went anywhere

---

[1] Epiphanius is the only heresiologist to discuss the Sampsaeans. Much of his material is based on the contents of Elxai's book, which he had read: see Pan. 19,1,4–4,6; Hippol. Haer. 9.13.2–4; Eus. H. E. 6.38. As a Palestinian, Epiphanius may have had some personal knowledge. Sampsaeans are mentioned in connection with Ossaeans and others at Pan. 19,2,1; 20,3,2; 30,3,2.

[2] Pan. 19,2,1; 20,3,2.

[3] Cf. Pan. 19,1,2; 20,3,2.

[4] Cf. Pan. 19,5,4.

[5] Cf., perhaps, the "Baptists" of the Life of Mani, CMC.

on foot, the crowds would follow them and take the dust of their feet for healing, if you please, and, since they were woefully deluded, their spittle too, and use them in phylacteries and amulets. For every error contracted blindness first, and nonsense next.

1,7 They accept neither prophets nor apostles, but all their ideas are delusion. They honor water and all but regard it as God, for they claim it is the source of life.[6]

1,8 They confess Christ in name but believe that he is a creature, and that he keeps appearing every now and then. He was formed for the first time in Adam, but when he chooses he takes Adam's body off and puts it on again. (9) He is called Christ, and the Holy Spirit is his sister, in female form. Each of them, Christ and the Holy Spirit, is ninety-six miles in height and twenty-four miles in width; and they < blab out* > a lot of other < nonsense* >.

2,1 I have often described these people before in the other Sects, and composed refutations; hence I do not think it is necessary to make a big thing of the demolition of a refutation [in their case], since I have already done it with Elxaeus, or Elxai himself, and his followers, in the other Sects I have mentioned. Anyone can tell that he and his sect are off the track. (2) Let us go on to the rest now, since we have struck him, like a solar lizard, with the cudgel of hope in Christ and his cross. For it is worth using the very name they have given themselves as a symbolic explanation of their phony title. "Sampsaeans" translated means "Solar";[7] this is why I have mentioned the beast.

2,3 For people call this lizard a "solar lizard." But this sect is inferior to the lizard, since it does not even have its momentary advantage. For though the lizard's sight is dim, it sometimes sees clearly with the aid of the sun's orb; < for > in its den, which faces eastward, it strains itself, fasting, towards the east, < and > when it sees the sun its sight loses its dimness. But in my opinion this sect has the lizard's foolishness in everything, and not even this little bit to its credit.

2,4 And so, now that this sect which we have called a solar lizard has also been trampled by the truth, < let remain in its foolishness >.

---

[6] With Brandt, Dummer and Amidon we punctuate with a comma after σχεδόν.

[7] Epiphanius derives Sampsaean from שמש.

Against Theodotians.[1] *34, but 54 of the series*

1,1 One Theodotus arose in his turn. He was an offshoot of the "Dumb" sect I have spoken of, which denies John's Gospel and the divine Word who it < declares > was "in the beginning," and John's Revelation. (2) He was also associated and contemporary with the other sects we have discussed, and was their successor in time.[2] The Theodotians, as they are called, derive from him. I do not know whether the sect is still in existence, but shall say what I have learned about it from written works.

1,3 Theodotus was from Byzantium,[3] which is now called Constantinople. He was a shoemaker by trade,[4] but a man of broad learning. (4) At the outset of a persecution—I cannot say which one—he with some others was arrested by the governor of the city, and was subjected to examination for Christ's sake along with the rest. All the other servants of God won their victory and attained heavenly rewards by their witness for Christ. (5) Theodotus, however, fell into transgression by denying Christ and missing the mark of the truth and, deeply ashamed because of his censure by many, fled his native land, moved to Rome and lived there.

1,6 But when he was recognized by the Christians in Rome, he once again incurred the same censure there; for he was charged, by those who knew him for his learning, with being a very learned man who had lost his grip on the truth. (7) But as a supposed lame excuse for himself he invented the following new doctrine that said, "I didn't deny God, I denied a man." Then, when they asked him, "Which man?" he answered, "I denied the man Christ."

1,8 Thereafter he, and the Theodotians whose founder he was, taught this doctrine of his and said that Christ is a mere man[5] begotten of a man's seed.[6] (9) Next, as a weak defense for himself, he collected whatever texts he found useful—not that he honestly thought [this was what they meant], but he amassed them as an excuse for his defection. He said, [for

---

[1] Epiph tells us at 1,2 that his sources are written; he plainly has some digest of Theodotus' arguments. For Theodotians see also Hipp. Haer.7.35.1–2; 8.9.35; 10.23.1–2; PsT 8.

[2] Hipp. Haer. 8.9.35 makes Theodotus "an offshoot of the Gnostics and Cerinthians, and the school of Ebion."

[3] Cf. Hipp. Haer. 7.35.1; PsT 8.

[4] Eus. H. E. 5.28.6.

[5] Hipp. Haer. 7.35.2; 10.23.1; Eus. H. E.5.28.6; PsT 8.

[6] Hippolytus reports the Theodotus taught the doctrine of the Virgin Birth but without deducing from it the divinity of Christ, Haer. 7.35.2. Cf. Pan 54,3,5.

example], "Christ said, 'But now ye seek to kill me, a *man* that hath told you the truth.'[7] You see," he said, "that Christ is a man."

2,1 But the wretch does not know that the Lord says in the same verse, "the truth which I have heard *of my Father*." He is saying that God is his father—not a man. (2) If he had heard the truth from a man he would not have boasted of his witness to the truth by saying that he had heard the truth from men. Instead he boasts of it to show that he is God, begotten of the Father on high but become man for us, and slain in the flesh, but living forever in his Godhead.

2,3 Theodotus says next that he has not committed sin by denying Christ. "For," says he, "Christ himself has said, 'All manner of blasphemy shall be forgiven men,' and, 'Whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but he that blasphemeth the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him here or in the world to come.'"[8]

2,4 And the unfortunate man does not know that, from a superabundance of meekness and lovingkindness, the Lord is saying this prophetically, in his desire to ensure in advance the salvation of those who have at one time blasphemed him and [then] returned to repentance, thus not sentencing them to condemnation. (5) [He is saying it besides] because he knows that certain persons will arise and blaspheme the Holy Spirit and place him in a slave's status, making him alien to the essence of God. (6) And so, as a precaution, he said, "He that blasphemeth against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him here or in the world to come"—not to commend those who blaspheme him, but to show his foreknowledge and lovingkindness by assuring in advance the salvation of those who blaspheme him and [then] repent. (7) For he himself, again, says, "He that hath denied me before men shall be denied before my Father,"[9] and, "I will deny him,"[10] and again, "He that confesseth me I will confess before my Father."[11]

3,1 And again this same Theodotus says, "The Law too said of him, 'The Lord will raise up unto you a prophet of your brethren, like unto me; hearken to him.'[12] But Moses was a man. Therefore the Christ whom God

---

7 John 8:40.
8 Matt 12:31–32.
9 Matt 10:33.
10 Matt 10:33.
11 Matt 10:32.
12 Deut 18:15.

raised up was this person but, since he was one of them, was a man just as Moses was a man."

3,2 Because of his lapse into transgression Theodotus has no understanding of the way in which each text has its safeguard. (3) The Lord raised Christ "from among his brethren" in the sense that he was born of Mary, as the scripture says, "Behold, the Virgin shall conceive and bear a son."[13] While still remaining a virgin "she shall conceive"—not from a man's seed—"and bear a *Son*;" it is plain that the Virgin's offspring was born in the flesh. But "They shall call his name Emmanuel which being interpreted, is *God* with us."[14] (4) For he is God and man: God, begotten of the Father without beginning and not in time; but man, born of Mary, because of the incarnation.

3,5 Next Theodotus says, "And the Gospel itself said to Mary, 'The Spirit of the Lord shall come upon thee';[15] it did not say, 'The Spirit of the Lord shall enter into thee.'" (6) For in his contentiousness the stupid man is deprived of the truth in every respect. In every way the scripture is protecting our salvation. To show that the Trinity is altogether and entirely co-existent and co-operant, and make sure that no one will echo the evil allegations which many make (7) to separate the Holy Spirit from Christ and < the > Father, the angel says to Mary, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee," and after that, "Therefore also that which is born of thee shall be called holy, the Son of God."

3,8 And he did not say merely, "that which is born," but, "*therefore also* that which is born < [shall be] holy >,"[16] to show that < the > divine Word from above also entered the womb and formed his own human nature in his image according to his good pleasure. And because of his human nature which he took for our salvation, the scripture adds, "Therefore also *that which is born* shall be called holy, the Son of God." (9) For if the angel had said, "The Holy Spirit shall enter into thee," it would not be possible to think that the Son of God had come in the flesh, but [only] that the Holy Spirit had come in the flesh.

3,10 But since he is the Word come from on high, John, to clarify what we hear from the angel in the Gospel, said, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things

---

[13] Isa 7:14.
[14] Matt 1:23.
[15] Luke 1:35. See note 6.
[16] Klostermann: <ἅγιον>.

were made by him, and without him was not anything made."[17] (11) Then, after this, "And the Word was made flesh."[18] And he did not say, "The Spirit was made flesh;" nor did he say, "Christ was born as a man." (12) On its guard at every turn, the sacred scripture knows him as God and man: God come from God on high, but man born of Mary without a man's seed. Whoever departs from these two truths is not of the truth.

4,1 The wretched Theodotus, once more, says by way of allegation, "Jeremiah too said of him, 'He he is a *man* and who will know him?' "[19] Because < he > had estranged himself from the truth < he> did not know that each verse, as I said, is self-interpreting. Whoever is a man is of course known by many acquaintances—I mean by his father and mother, brothers and relatives, friends and neighbors, fellow townsmen, household servants. (3) But here, to describe the marvel of Christ's whole work, the scripture called him "man" because of the incarnation, but gave indication of his incomprehensible Godhead by saying, "Who will know him?" (4) For since "No man knoweth the Son save the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him,"[20] no one will know Christ unless < Christ himself > reveals it to him. (5) But by the Holy Spirit he reveals his own and his Father's Godhead and glory to his servants, and his eternal life to come, his mysteries, his teaching, and his true advent in the flesh for our sakes; for he is God from on high, and man from Mary.

5,1 Then Theodotus says in turn, "Isaiah too called him a man, for he said, 'A *man* acquainted with the bearing of infirmity; and we knew him afflicted with blows and abuse, and he was despised and not esteemed.' "[21] (2) But the oaf does not know how he is confounded once more. In that very passage Isaiah said the following: "He was brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a lamb before its shearer is dumb so he opened not his mouth. In his humiliation his judgment was taken away"[22]—(3) then he says, "Who can declare his generation, for his life is taken from men?"[23] And he didn't say, "His life was taken < from > *him*," but, "from *men*." (4) For the Word is forever living and in being, has life of himself, and

[17] John 1:1; 3.
[18] John 1:14.
[19] Jer 17:8.
[20] Matt 11:27.
[21] Isa 53:3.
[22] Isa 53:7–8a.
[23] Cf. Isa 53:6b.

gives life to those who love him. His life was taken *from men*, but < as God he lives* > and is life of himself. For "The Word is living,"[24] and provides life to all who have truly placed their hopes in him..

5,5 And the words, "Who can declare his generation?" < cannot be applied to a man* >. If he were a mere man born of Mary, it would be easy to declare his generation. But since he is before David, < and > before Abraham—(6) "Your father Abraham," he says, "desired to see my day, and he saw it and was glad."[25] And then, when they said in astonishment, "Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou see Abraham?"[26] in refutation of Theodotus and the unbelieving Jews who deny God he said, "Verily, verily I say unto you, before Abraham, I am."[27] (7) For he was truly before Abraham, and before Noah, Adam, the world, heaven, the time of the universe, and the time of all creatures, for he is not in time. (8) And this is why, through Isaiah, he is declared incomprehensible by the Holy Spirit: "Who can declare his generation? For his life is taken from the earth."[28]

5,9 Theodotus, however, says, "The holy apostles called him 'a *man* approved among you by signs and wonders;'[29] and they did not say, 'God approved.'" (10) But Theodotus, you are foiled again. On the contrary, the same apostles [said that he was God] in the same Acts, as the blessed Stephen said, "Behold, I see heaven open, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God."[30]

6,1 His next allegation is that 'The apostle called him the mediator between God and man, the *man* Christ Jesus.'"[31] (2) And he does not realize how he is attacking himself once more. The apostle who said, "mediator between God and man, < the man > Christ Jesus," clarified this himself by saying, "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead, our Lord Jesus Christ;"[32] and again, "made of a woman, made under the Law."[33] (3) And in confirmation of these statements he says, "If there be that are called gods many and lords many, yet to us there is one God, of whom are all

[24] Heb 4:12.
[25] Cf. John 8:56 and Matt 13:17.
[26] John 8:57.
[27] John 8:58.
[28] Isa 53:6b.
[29] Acts 2:22.
[30] Acts 7:56.
[31] 1 Tim 2:5.
[32] Rom 1:4.
[33] Gal 4:4.

things, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things < and we for him >."[34] (4) But if "All things are by him and we are for him," the Only-begotten cannot be a mere man < who dates > from Mary, or the product of a man's seed. If he was a mere man, how could all things be by him when, as you say, they were before him? Or how could all things be for him, when they were known and made before him? And Theodotus' foolishness fails completely.

6,5 During the debate itself I have both said what I know of Theodotus, and given the refutation of each of his arguments. In the manner of the series I shall pass him by as though, with the hope and faith of the truth, I had struck and killed part of a still wriggling snake. Let us investigate the rest, and hurry on to take a look at the sects in all their savagery.

Against Melchizedekians,[1] *35, but 55 of the series*

1,1 In turn, others call themselves Melchizedekians; they may be an offshoot of the group who are known as Theodotians. (2) They honor the Melchizedek who is mentioned in the scriptures and regard him as a sort of great power.[2] He is on high in places which cannot be named, and in < fact > is not just a power; indeed, they claim in their error that he is greater than Christ.[3] (3) Based, if you please, on the literal wording of, "Thou art a priest forever *after the order* of Melchizedek,"[4] they believe that Christ has merely come and been given the order of Melchizedek. Christ is thus younger than Melchizedek, they say. For if his place were not somehow second in line[5] he would have no need of Melchizedek's rank.

1,4 Of Melchizedek himself they say that he < has come into being > "without father, without mother, without lineage"[6]—as they would like to

---

[34] 1 Cor 8:5–6.

[1] The Qumran Melchizedek fragments,(11Q Melch), 2 Enoch 71–72, Pistis Sophia and the Nag Hammadi tractate Melchizedek (NHC IX,1) all witness to Melchizedek's importance in many ancient circles. Patristic notices of the Melchizedekean heresy are found at Eus. H. E. 5.28.8–10; Hippol. Haer. 7.36; PsT 8; Jer. Ep. 73. Cf. Pan 67,7.

[2] In Pistis Sophia the heavenly Melchizedek is the "paralemptor of the light," who restores imprisoned light to the treasury of light, PS 34–36; 194–195 et al. NHC's Melchizedek implies that his origin is heavenly, Melch. 6,16–19. At 11QMelch he conducts the last judgment and is termed "El."

[3] Hipp. Haer. 7.36; PsT 8.

[4] Ps 109:4.

[5] The translation is problematic.

[6] Heb 7:3.

show from St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews. (5) They also fabricate spurious books for their own deception.

1,6 Their refutation comes from the texts themselves. When David prophesies that the Lord will be a priest after the order of Melchizedek, the sacred scripture is saying in the same breath that Christ will be a priest. (7) But we find that < Paul > says at once, "Made like unto the Son of God, [Melchizedek] abideth a priest continually."[7] Now if he is made *like* the Son of God, he is not *equal* to the Son of God. How can the servant be the master's equal? (8) For Melchizedek was a man. "Without father, without mother," is not said because he had no father or mother, but because his father and mother are not explicitly named in the sacred scripture.

1,9 The profundities and glories of the sacred scripture, which are beyond human understanding, have confused many. The natives of Petra in Arabia, which is called Rokom and Edom, were in awe of Moses because of his miracles, and at one time they made an image of him, and mistakenly undertook[8] to worship it. They had no true cause for this, but in their ignorance their error drew an imaginary inference from something real. (10) And in Sebasteia, which was once called Samaria, they have declared Jephthah's daughter a goddess, and still hold a festival in her honor every year. (11) Similarly, these people have heard the glorious, wise words of the scripture and changed them to stupidity. With over-inflated pride they have abandoned the way of the truth, and will be shown to have fabricated stories of their own invention.

2,1 In fact Melchizedek's father and mother are mentioned by some authors, though this is not based on the canonical, covenanted scriptures. Still, some have said that his father was a man called Heracles, and his mother was Astarth, the same as Astoriane. He was the son of one of the inhabitants of the country at that time, who lived in the plain of Save. (2) And the city was called Salem, and various authors have given different accounts of it. Some say that it is the city now known as Jerusalem, though it was once called Jebus. But others have said that there was another Salem in the plain of Sicimi, opposite the town which is now called Neapolis.

2,3 But whether it was the one location or the other—the places are not far apart—in any case the passage tells what happened. It says, "He brought forth bread and wine for Abraham, and at that time he was the

[7] Heb 7:3.
[8] Holl: ἐπιχειροῦν MSS: προσεκύνουν.

priest of God Most High.[9] And he blessed Abraham, and took a tithe from him. (4) For the priest of God Most High had to be honored by a servant of God, and—since the circumcised priesthood would stem from Abraham himself—Abraham had to offer first to the priest who served without circumcision, so that "Every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God"[10] would be humbled. (5) Thus the circumcised, who boast of priesthood, could not dispute the priesthood of God's holy church, which observes neither bodily circumcision nor the absence of it, but possesses the greater and more perfect circumcision, the laver of regeneration.

2,6 For if Abraham offered a tithe to Melchizedek but Abraham's descendants offer it to Aaron and Levi, and next, after the priesthood had become circumcised through Aaron and his sons, the scripture says through David that the priesthood is vested in Melchizedek—says this twelve generations after Levi's birth and after seven generations from the succession of Aaron—it has shown that the priestly rank does not remain with the ancient circumcised priesthood. (7) It was transferred to [a priesthood] before Levi and before Aaron, the priesthood after the order of Melchizedek, which now, since the Lord's incarnation, resides in the church. The seed is no longer chosen [for priesthood] because of a succession; a type is looked for, because of virtue.

3,1 For the first uncircumcised priesthood is reckoned through Abel; after that, moreover, through Noah. But a third [such priesthood] is reckoned through Melchizedek, who did not serve God by circumcision but by perfect righteousness and virtue, and with body uncircumcised. (2) And that Melchizedek was a man, God's holy apostle himself will show in his epistle. For he says, "He whose descent is not counted *from them* received tithes of the patriarch."[11] It is plain that his descent is not traced *from them*, but from others.

3,3 And of how many others is the ancestry not expressly given? Daniel, Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego, Elijah the Tishbite—neither their fathers nor their mothers are found anywhere in any of the covenanted scriptures. But so that no error arises from this, it will do no harm to say what I have learned from tradition myself. (4) For I have found that Daniel's father was a man called Sabaan. And I have likewise actually found Elijah's lineage, and shall trace it in order: (5) Elijah the Tishbite

[9] Cf. Gen 10:18.
[10] 2 Cor 10:5.
[11] Heb 7:6.

was the brother of Jehoiada the priest. He too was supposedly of priestly descent and was the son of Ahinoam. But Ahinoam was the son of Zadok, and Zadok the son of Ahitub the son of Amoriah. Amoriah was the son of Razaza, Razaza of Ahaziah, and Ahaziah of Phineas. Phineas was the son of Eleazar, and Eleazar was the son of Aaron, plainly Aaron the [high]-priest. Aaron was the son of Amram, Amram of Cohath, Cohath of Levi, and Levi was the third son of Jacob. But Jacob was the brother of Esau and the son of Isaac, and Isaac was the son of Abraham.

3,6 But the genealogies of these persons are by no means plainly set forth in the canonical scriptures—just parts of the subject as it pertains to Elijah, in Chronicles.[12] However I have simply not found the fathers of the three children, Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego, either in traditions or in apocryphal works. (7) What about that? Will they too—Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego—delude us into drawing wrong inferences, wondering far too much about each [one's] lineage, and concluding that they have no fathers and mothers? Let's hope not! (8) Apostolic traditions, holy scriptures and successions of teachers have been made our boundaries and foundations for the upbuilding of our faith,[13] and God's truth has been protected in every way. No one need be deceived by worthless stories.

4,1 But to return to the subject, the things they imagine about Melchizedek. It is plain that this righteous man was holy, a priest of God, and the king of Salem, but he was no part of the < order > in heaven, and has not come down from heaven. (2) "No man hath ascended up to heaven save he that came down from heaven, the Son of Man,"[14] says the holy divine Word who tells no lies.

4,3 For when the sacred scripture proclaimed, and the Holy Spirit expressly taught, the order of Melchizedek, they indicated the removal of the priesthood from the ancient synagogue and the < physical* > nation to a nation which is the finest and best, and which is not united by a common physical descent. (4) For this holy Melchizedek had no successors, but neither did he suffer the abolition of his priesthood. He remained a priest himself throughout his life and is still celebrated as a priest in the scripture, since no one either succeeded him or abolished the priesthood which he had during his time of service. (5) Thus our Lord too—though

[12] Cf. 1 Chron 6:3–5.
[13] Codex Urbinas, Codex Marcianus, Delahaye εἰς οἰκοδομήν, Holl καὶ οἰκοδομή.
[14] John 3:13.

he was not a man but the holy divine Word of God, God's Son begotten without beginning and not in time, ever with the Father but for our sakes become man, of Mary and not of a man's seed—our Lord, < receiving* > the priesthood, offers to the Father, having taken human clay so as to be made a priest for us after the order of Melchizedek, which has no succession. (6) For he abides forever, offering gifts for us—after first offering himself through the cross, to abolish every sacrifice of the old covenant by presenting the more perfect, living sacrifice for the whole world. (7) He himself is temple, he himself sacrifice, himself priest, altar, God, man, king, high-priest, lamb, sacrificial victim—become all in all for us that life may be ours in every way, and in order to lay the changeless foundation of his priesthood forever, no longer allotting it by descent and succession, but granting that, in accordance with his ordinance, it may be preserved in the Holy Spirit.

5,1 Others in their turn say < other > imaginary < things > about this Melchizedek. (Since they lack a spiritual understanding of the things the holy apostle said in this same Epistle to the Hebrews, they have been condemned by a fleshly sentence.) (2) The Egyptian heresiarch Hieracas believes that this Melchizedek is the Holy Spirit[15] because of "made like unto the Son of God he abideth a priest continually,"[16] (3) as though this is to be interpreted by the holy apostle's "*The Spirit* maketh intercession for us with groanings that cannot be uttered."[17]

Anyone who understands the mind of the Spirit knows that he intercedes with God for the elect.[18] But Hieracas too has gone entirely off the track. (4) The Spirit never assumed flesh. And not having assumed flesh, he could not be king of Salem and priest of anywhere. (5) In time, however, when I compose the refutation of Hieracas and his sect, I shall discuss this at length; for now, I shall resume the order of presentation.

6,1 But how many other fancies do others have about this Melchizedek! Samaritans believe that he is Noah's son Shem,[19] but it will be found that they too are absurd. (2) The sacred scripture, which secures everything with due order, has confirmed the truth in every respect; not for nothing

---

[15] So at Jer. Ep. 73.1.1–2; also at 2.1, where Jerome attributes the idea to Origen and his follower Didymus. Cf. Chrysost. De Melch. 3; Cyr. Alex. Glaph. In Gen. 1.2.7.

[16] Heb 7:3.

[17] Rom 8:26.

[18] Rom 8:26 and cf. 8:27.

[19] Jer. Ep. 73.5.4; Quaest. Hebraicae in Gen 1, PL 23, 961; Comment. Ad Isa. 41, PL 24,441B. At 2 Enoch 71–72 Melchizedek is the son of Noah's brother Nir.

has it listed the time periods, and enumerated the years of each patriarch's life and succession.

6,3 For when Abraham was about eighty-eight or even ninety, Melchizedek met him and served him loaves and wine, prefiguring the symbols of the mysteries: (4) types < of the Lord's body >, since our Lord < himself > says, "I am the living bread"[20]; and of the blood which flowed from his side for the cleansing of the defiled, and the sprinkling and salvation of our souls.

6,5 Now when he became the father of Abraham, Abraham's father Terah was seventy years old, and that made about 160 years. Nahor fathered Terah at the age of seventy-nine, and that made 239 years. Serug fathered Nahor at the age of 130, and that made 369 years. (6) Reu fathered Serug when he was 132, and that came to the five hundred and first year. Peleg fathered Reu when he was 130, and that made 631 years. Eber fathered Peleg in the hundred and thirty-fourth year of his life, and that made 765 years.

6,7 Shelah fathered Eber in the two hundred thirtieth year of his life, and that made 895 years. Cainan fathered Shelah in the hundred ninth year of his life, and that made 1004 years. Arphaxad was 135 when he fathered Cainan, and that made 1139 years. (8) And the Shem we spoke of, whom the Samaritans imagine to be Melchizedek, fathered Arphaxad in the hundred second year of his life, and altogether there were 1241 years until the time of Abraham, when he met Melchizedek on his return from the slaughter of the kings Amraphel, Arioch, Chedorlaomer and Tidal.

6,9 But Shem did not live that many years, as their foolish imagination would have it. He was 102 when he became the father of Arphaxad, in the second year after the flood. "And after that he lived 500 years," as the sacred scripture says, "and begat sons and daughters, and died."[21] (10) Now then, if he lived for 602 years and then died, how could he reach the age of 1241 so that, after ten generations and 1241 years, they can call Shem the son of Noah, who lived ten generations before Abraham, Melchizedek? How greatly people can go wrong!

6,11 But if we go by the figure in other copies, there are about 628 years from the date of Shem's birth until the time of Abraham's meeting with Melchizedek, in the eighty-eighth or ninetieth year of Abraham's life. Thus

[20] John 6:51.
[21] Cf. Gen 11:11.

on no account can Shem have lived until Abraham's time, to be thought of as Melchizedek. And the Samaritans' jabber also is all wrong.

7,1 In their turn, the Jews say that Melchizedek was righteous, good and the priest of the Most High, as the sacred scripture says, but that since he was the son of a harlot his mother's name is not recorded, and his father is not known. (2) But their silly assertion too has failed. Rahab was a harlot, and she is in scripture. Zimri is in scripture too although he committed fornication, and Cozbi with him, even though she was a foreigner and not of Israelite descent. < For the Savior receives harlots, if only they repent through him* >. And as the holy Gospel said, "Whoso entereth not by the door is a thief and not a shepherd."[22]

7,3 But some who are actually in the church put this Melchizedek in various categories. Some suppose that he is the actual Son of God,[23] and appeared to Abraham then in the form of a man. (4) But they too have gone off the track; no one will ever become "like" himself. As the sacred scripture says, "made *like unto* the Son of God he abideth a priest continually."[24] (5) Indeed "He whose descent is not counted *of them* received tithes of Abraham;"[25] for since his descent is not counted from the Israelites themselves, it is counted from other people. (6) Having listed all these errors < which > I recall because of this sect, I describe them as though in passing.

8,1 This sect makes its offerings in Melchizedek's name, and says that it is he who conducts us to God[26] and that we must offer to God through him because he is an archon of righteousness[27] ordained in heaven by God for this very purpose, a spiritual being and appointed to God's priesthood. (2) And we must make offerings to him, they say, so that they may be offered through him on our behalf,[28] and through him we may attain to life. (3) Christ too was chosen, they say, to summon us from many ways

---

[22] John 10:1.

[23] Cf. NHC Melch. 25,4–26,4 "And [you crucified me] from the third hour [of the Sabbath-eve] until [the ninth hour]. And after [these things I arose] from the dead. My body] came out of [the tomb] to me. [. . . they did not] find anyone . . . They said to me, Be [strong, O Melchizedek]] great [High Priest] of God [Most High]." See also 2 En. J 71.37, where Christ seems to be identified with Melchizedek.

[24] Heb 7:3.

[25] Heb 7:6.

[26] Perhaps cf. n. 2.

[27] ἄρχων ἐστί δικαιοσύνης. At 2 En. J. 71.29 Melchizedek is "the priest to all holy priests, the head of the priests of the future."

[28] For a comparable idea about offering see Pan 26,9,7.

to this one knowledge. He was anointed by God and made his elect, for he turned us from idols and showed us the way. After that the apostle was sent and revealed Melchizedek's greatness to us, and that he remains a priest forever. (4) And see how great he is, and that the lesser is blessed by the greater. (5) And thus, they say, Melchizedek also blessed the patriarch Abraham, since he was greater [than Abraham]. And we are his initiates, so that we too may be recipients of his blessing.

9,1 And how worthless all the sects' notions are! See here, these too have denied their Master who "bought them with his own blood"[29]— (2) whose existence does not date from Mary as they suppose, but who is ever with the Father as the divine Word, begotten of the Father without beginning and not in time, as every scripture says. It was to him, not to Melchizedek, that the Father said, "Let us make man in our image and after our likeness."[30]

9,3 For even though Melchizedek was priest of God Most High in his own generation and had no successors, he did not come down from heaven. (4) The scripture said, not that he brought bread and wine *down*, but that he brought them *out* to Abraham and his companions as though from his palace,[31] to show the patriarch hospitality[32] as he passed through his country. And he blessed Abraham for his righteousness, faithfulness and piety. (5) For though the patriarch had been tried in everything, in nothing had he lost his righteousness, but here too he had God's assistance against the kings who had attacked Sodom < like bandits >[33] and carried off his nephew, the holy Lot. And he brought him back, with all the booty and spoil.

9,6 Where can we not find proof that < the > Son was always with the Father? For "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God;"[34] it did not say, "In the beginning was Melchizedek," or, "And Melchizedek was God." (7) And again, "The Lord came to Abraham, and the Lord rained fire and brimstone from the Lord upon Sodom and Gomorrah.[35] And the apostle himself said, "One

---

[29] Cf. Acts 20:28; 1 Cor 6:20; 7:23.
[30] Gen 1:26.
[31] Klostermann, MSS βασιλείων, Holl. βασιλέων.
[32] Klostermann, Codex Marcianus ἀποδεξάμενος, Holl and other MSS ἀποδεξόμενος.
[33] Holl: ληστρικῶς, MSS ἀληθῶς.
[34] John 1:1.
[35] Gen 19:24.

God, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things."[36]

9,8 And lest someone say, "Well then, where is the Spirit, since he speaks of 'one' and 'one'?"—the Spirit must not act as its own guarantor.[37] For the sacred scripture is always preserved to serve as an example for us. The apostle was speaking *in the Holy Spirit* and saying, "One God, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things." He was *in the Spirit* saying this, for the intent was not to make the Trinity deficient. (9) But the Lord himself plainly says, "Go baptize all nations in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.[38] And the apostle says in his turn, "One is the Spirit, dividing to every man as he will to profit withal."[39]

9,10 There you are then, the Father! The Son! The Holy Spirit! And nowhere does it say of Melchizedek that < he is resident > in the gifts or in the heights.[40] There is no point in these people's yapping about the falsehoods and fictions of the stumbling blocks they encounter—not things that originate in the truth, but in the hissing of the dragon itself, with his ability to deceive and mislead each sect.

9,11 Again, I have heard that some, who are further afield than all of these and are excited by further pride of intellect, have dared to resort to an unthinkable idea and arrive at a blasphemous notion, and say that this same Melchizedek is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. (12) What careless minds men have, and what deceived hearts, with no place for truth! Since the apostle says that Melchizedek has no father and mother and is without lineage, these people have gone wrong because of the sublimity of the expression, have < foolishly* > supposed < that what is said of Melchizedek* > corresponds with the Father of all, and have imagined a blasphemous imposture.

9,13 For because God the almighty, the Father of all, has no father, mother, beginning of days or end of life—for this is admitted by everyone—they have fallen into foolish blasphemy by likening Melchizedek

---

[36] 1 Cor 8:6.

[37] I.e., as the Speaker in the scriptures the Holy Spirit should not expressly commend himself, since this would be a bad example for humankind. Cf. 57,5,7.

[38] Matt 28:19.

[39] 1 Cor 12:11.

[40] Holl: ἐμπολιτεύεταὶ MSS: δωρεῖται.

to him because the apostle has spoken of Melchizedek in this way, not noticing the other things that are said about him. (14) For it is said of Melchizedek that "He was *priest of God* Most High."[41] Now assuming that Melchizedek is the Most High and the Father, then, as the priest of another "Most High," he cannot be the Father of all himself–serving another Most High as priest.

9,15 Such confusion on people's part, that will not perceive truth but is bent on error! To give the final solution of the entire problem, the holy apostle said, "He whose descent is not counted *from them*"—obviously not; but it was counted from others—"received tithes of Abraham."[42] And again, he said, "who, *in the days of his flesh*, offered up supplications and prayers to him that was able to save him"[43]—but it is plain that < the > Father did not assume flesh.

9,16 But now that we have discussed them sufficiently too, let us leave this sect, for we have struck it with the firm faith and its foundation, as though we had hit a mousing viper with a rock and avoided its deadly poison. For they say that the mousing viper does no immediate harm to the one it bites, but that in time it destroys his body and infects its victim with leprosy in every limb. (17) Similarly, if this heresy is < implanted* > in their minds it < does* > people no apparent < harm > when they first hear of these things. But the long-term effect of the words is to sink into their minds, raise questions, and, as it were, cause the destruction of those who have not happened on the remedy of this antidote—the refutation of this heresy, and the counter-argument to it which I have given.

9,18 The mousing viper is not readily seen; it is active at night and does its harm at that time, especially in Egypt. Thus those who do not know the beast must realize that, when I compared it with the harm that is done by this sect, I did not bring up the subject of the beast lightly, or as a slander; it does this sort of injury. (19) But I shall move on to the others next, so as to thank God for the privilege of keeping my promise in God.

---

41 Gen 14:18.
42 Heb 7:6.
43 Heb 5:7.

Against Bardesianists[1] *36, but 56 of the series*

1,1 Their successor was a person named Bardesanes. This Bardesanes, the founder of the Bardesianist sect, was Mesopotamian and a native of the city of Edessa.[2] (2) He was the finest sort of man at first, and while his mind was sound composed no few treatises.[3] For originally he belonged to God's holy church, and he was learned in the two languages, Greek and Syriac.[4]

1,3 At first he became friends with the ruler of Edessa, Abgar,[5] a very holy and learned man, and assisted him while taking a hand in his education. He survived after Abgar's death until the time of Antoninus Caesar—not Antoninus Pius, but Antoninus Verus.[6] (4) He argued at length against fate < in reply to > the astrologer Abidas, and there are other works of his which are in accord with the godly faith.[7]

1,5 He defied Antoninus' companion Apollonius besides, by refusing to say that he had denied that he called himself a Christian. He nearly became a martyr, and in a courageous defense of godliness replied that the wise do not fear death, which would come of necessity, < he said >, even if he did not oppose the emperor. (6) And thus the man was loaded with every honor until he came to grief over the error of his own sect and became like the finest ship, which was filled with a priceless cargo and [then] wrecked beside the cliffs of its harbor, losing all its freight and occasioning the deaths of its other passengers as well.

2,1 For he unfortunately fell in with Valentinians, drew this poison and tare from their unsound doctrine, and taught this heresy by introducing many first principles and emanations himself, and denying the resurrection of the dead.[8]

---

[1] Epiphanius' most likely source for this Sect is Eus. H. E. 4.30.1–3, although his memory of it is faulty. Other accounts are found at Eus. Praep. Ev. 6.9.32; Hippol. Haer. 7.31.1; Jer. Adv. Jov. 2.14.

[2] Hippolytus makes him an Armenian, Haer. 7.31.1; Julius Africanus, a Parthian, 29; Porphyrius, a Babylonian, De Abst. 4.17.

[3] Cf. Eus H. E. 4.30.1.

[4] Cf. Eus H. E. 4.30.1.

[5] Abgar IV Manu. See Holl-Dummer II p. 338.

[6] Epiphanius means Marcus Aurelius, but the emperor under whom Bardesanes flourished would have been Caracalla or Elagabalus.

[7] Portions of the Book of the Laws of the Lands, which is apparently Bardesanes' work against astrology, seem to be preserved at Eus. Praep. Ev. 5.9.

[8] Eusebius says that Bardesanes was an ex-Valentinian who later wrote against this view, though he never abandoned it altogether, H. E. 4.30.3. Epiph conjectures the teaching

2,2 He uses the Law and the Prophets and the Old and the New Testaments, besides certain apocrypha. (3) But he too, like all his predecessors and successors, will be confounded because he has separated himself from the truth and, as it were, from a brightly shining lamp turned into soot.

2,4 I have already spoken of the resurrection of the dead in many Sects; however, it will do no harm to say a few words once more in my refutation of this man. (5) For if you accept the Old Testament, Mister, and the New Testament too, how can you not be convicted of corrupting the way of the truth and separating yourself from the Lord's true life?

2,6 For < it is plain > that, to become the earnest of our resurrection and the firstborn from the dead, the Lord himself first died for us and rose again. (7) And he did not suffer simply in appearance; he was buried, and they bore his body to the grave. Joseph of Arimathea bears witness, and the women bear witness who brought the unguents to the tomb and the hundred pounds' weight of ointment, that this was no phantom or apparition . (8) The angels who appeared to the women are also witnesses that "He is risen, he is not here; why seek ye the living among the dead?"[9] (9) And they did not say that he had not died, but that he had risen—he who suffered in the flesh but lives forever in the Spirit, and who, in his native Godhead, is impassible; he who is eternally begotten of the Father on high, but in the last days was pleased to be made man of the Virgin Mary, as St. Paul testifies by saying, "made of a woman, made under the Law."[10]

2,10 Haven't you yet heard the text, "This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality?"[11] Hasn't the prophet Isaiah convinced you by saying, "And the dead shall arise, and they that are in the graves shall be raised up?"[12] And the Lord himself, by saying, "And these shall be raised to life eternal, and these to everlasting punishment?"[13]

2,11 Or don't you remember Abel's conversation with God after his death, and how it doesn't say that his soul intercedes and cries out to God, but that his blood does? But blood is not soul; the soul is in the blood. (12) For the visible blood is body, but the soul resides invisibly in

---

of "first principles and emanations" from Eus.' mention of Bardesanes' Valentinian connection.

[9] Cf. Luke 24:5–6.

[10] Gal 4:4.

[11] 1 Cor. 15:53.

[12] Isa 26:19.

[13] Cf. Matt 25:46.

the blood. And your wrong belief is confounded from every standpoint, Bardesanes, for it is demolished by the truth itself.

3,1 But since I have spoken at length on the topic of many first principles, against those who say that there are such things, I shall not make my discussion of this here a long one. As though in < passing >, however, I shall mention how the holy apostle says, "To us God the Father is one, of whom are all things and we in him; and the Lord Jesus Christ is one, by whom are all things and we by him."[14] (2) How can there be a plurality of gods and many first principles if "Our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things and we by him, is one?" There is therefore one creator, not many gods or many aeons. For Paul said, "If there be many *so-called* gods;"[15] (3) but he pronounced them "so-called" as though speaking < of > beings which have no existence. But because of the so-called gods of the Greeks, the ones they have made gods of—the sun and moon, the stars and the like—he made this declaration, and ruled out the notion of all who have fallen into error.

3,4 Now since the sound faith is preserved in every way as the support and the salvation of the faithful, the nonsensical inventions of all the sects have been overthrown. So has this man, overthrown, made of himself a pitiable object and banished himself from life. (5) For the prophet tells God's holy church, "I will make thy stone a coal of fire, and thy foundations sapphire, and thy walls precious stones, and thy battlements jasper."[16] Then, afterwards, he says, "Every voice that rises up against thee, thou shalt overcome them all. Against thee it shall not prevail."[17] (6) Nothing will prevail against the true faith, since "She is founded on the rock," and, as her king, bridegroom, Lord and Master, the holy divine Word, has promised her, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against her."[18] To him, the Father in the Son with the Holy Spirit, be glory, honor and might forever and ever. Amen.

3,7 But since this sect too has been trampled underfoot, < let it lie* >, struck with the wood of life, like a head [cut off] from a piece of a snake and still wriggling. < But > let us ourselves give thanks to God, beloved, and proceed once more to the examination of the rest.

---

[14] 1 Cor 8:6.
[15] 1 Cor 8:5.
[16] Isa 54:11–12.
[17] Cf. Isa 54:17.
[18] Matt 16:18.

Against Noetians[1] *37, but 57 of the series*

1,1 Another one, whose name was Noetus, arose in his turn after Bardesanes, not many years ago but about 130 years before our time,[2] an Asian from the city of Ephesus.[3] (2)[4] By the inspiration of a strange spirit he chose to say and teach things on his own authority which neither the prophets nor the apostles < had proclaimed >, and which the church from the beginning had neither held nor conceived of. On his own authority he dared to say, with manic elation, that the Father suffered. (3) And then, from further delirious conceit he called himself Moses, and his brother, Aaron.[5]

1,4 In the meantime, however, the blessed presbyters of the church sent for Noetus because of the rumor about him, and questioned him about all these things, and whether he had put forth this blasphemy of the Father.[6] (5) At first he denied it when brought before the presbytery, since no one before him had belched out this frightful, deadly bitterness. (6) But later, after, as it were, infecting certain others with his madness and winning about ten men over, inspired to greater pride and insolence < and > grown bold, he began to teach his heresy openly. (7) The same presbyters summoned him once more, and the men who unfortunately had become acquainted with him, and asked again about the same things. (8) But now, with his followers in error, Noetus struck his forehead and openly opposed them. "What wrong have I done," he demanded, "because I glorify one God?[7] I know one God and none other besides him, and he has been born, has suffered, and has died!"[8]

1,9 Since he held to this they expelled him from the church, with the men he had instructed in his own doctrine. He himself has died recently as has his brother, but not in glory like Moses; nor was his brother buried

---

[1] Epiphanius' source for this Sect is Hippolytus' tractate, Contra Noetum, which is taken by Pourkier, Hilgenfeld and Lipsius as the last chapter of Hippolytus' Syntagma, by Schwarz and others as part of an Hippolytean homily. Noetus is also discussed at Filast. Haer. 53; Hippol. Haer. 9.2.7–10; 10.27.

[2] "Not many years ago" comes from Hippol. C. Noet. 1; Epiph has inserted the rest.

[3] Hippol. C. Noet. 1; Filast. Haer. 53.

[4] 1,2 is paraphrased from Hippol. C. Noet. 1.

[5] Cf. Hippol. C. Noet. 1; Filast. Haer. 53.

[6] Noetus' examination before the "blessed presbyters"—terminology which is rather unusual for Epiphanius—comes from Hippol. C. Noet. 1.

[7] With all of this cf. Hippol. C. Noet. 1.

[8] The formula, and the excommunication of Noetus, are taken from Hippol. C. Noet. 1.

with honor like Aaron. They were cast out as transgressors, and none of the godly would lay them out for burial.

1,10 Those whose minds he had corrupted confirmed this doctrine afterwards under the influence of the following texts, which had influenced their false teacher to begin with. (11)[9] (For when he said under questioning by the presbytery that he glorified one God, they told him truthfully, "We too glorify one God, but in the way we know is right. (12) And we hold that Christ is one, but as we know the one Christ—the Son of God who suffered as he suffered, died as he died, has risen, has ascended into heaven, is at the right hand of the Father, will come to judge the quick and the dead. We say these things because we have learned them from the sacred scriptures, which we also know.")

2,1[10] Those, then, who are offshoots of Noetus himself, and those who derive from them, make much of this doctrine, and try to establish their insane teaching from the following texts. Among them are God's words to Moses, "I am the God of your fathers. I am the first and I am the last. Thou shalt have none other gods," and so on.[11] (2) They said accordingly, "We therefore know him alone. If Christ came and was born, he himself is the Father; he himself is the Son. Thus the same God is the God who < is > forever, and who has now come—(3) as the scripture says, 'This is thy God, none other shall be accounted God besides him. He hath found out every way of understanding and given it to Jacob his servant and Israel his beloved. Afterwards he appeared on earth and consorted with men.'[12] (4) Again, they say, "do you see how, by saying that God himself is < the > only God and appeared later himself, the sacred scriptures give us the wisdom not to believe first in one God and then in another?"

2,5[13] Again, they make use of this further text: "Egypt hath wearied and the merchandise of the Ethiopians, and the lofty men of Saba shall pass over unto thee and be thy servants. And they shall walk behind thee bound with chains, and shall bow down to thee and pray through thee—for in thee is God and there is no God beside thee—Thou art God and we knew it not, O God of Israel, the Savior."[14] (6) "Do you see," they

[9] 1,11–12 closely follow Hippol C. Noet. 2.
[10] 2,1–3 closely follow Hippol. C. Noet. 2.
[11] Cf. Exod 3:6; Isa 44:6; Exod 20:3.
[12] Baruch 3:36–38.
[13] 2,5–7a closely follow Hippol. C. Noet. 2–3.
[14] Isa 45:14–15.

say, "how the sacred scriptures state that God is one, and declare that he < has become > visible? And he is admittedly one, forever the same. (7) We therefore say that there are not many gods but one God, the same Impassible, himself the Father of the Son and himself the Son, who has suffered to save us by his suffering. And we cannot say that there is another"—having supposedly learned this confession of faith, and this impious conjecture and ruinous madness, from their master.

2,8[15] Next they cite other texts in their support—as their teacher said, "The apostle also bears witness in the following words and says, 'Whose are the fathers, of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for evermore. Amen.'"[16] (9) But their account [of Christ] is as one-sided as Theodotus'. Theodotus actually went to one extreme and described him as a mere man. Noetus has one-sidedly described another extreme in his own turn, with his belief that the same God the Father is both the Son and the Holy Spirit, and that he has suffered in the flesh, and been born. (10) Theodotus' followers have not told the truth, then, and neither have this "Brainy" (Νόητος)—"Brainless," actually—and his, since the sacred scriptures refute them both, and all the erring.

3,1 To anyone whose mind is < sound* > in God, and who is enlightened in sacred scripture and the Holy Spirit, their argument will appear easy to refute and full of all sorts of nonsense. (2) The idea of claiming that the Father, the Son, and the One who suffered are the same, is the result of impudence and is < full > of blindness.[17] (3) How can the same person be father and son [at once]? If he is a son he must be the son of some person by whom he has been begotten. (4) But if he is a father, he cannot possibly beget himself. In turn something called a son didn't beget itself; it was begotten by a father. How crazy people are, with their fallacious reasoning! (5) For the fact is that the logical conclusion is not as they suppose, but as the truth tells us through the sacred scripture. The Lord states it at once by saying, "Lo, my beloved Son shall understand, he whom I have chosen, whom my soul hath loved. I will put my Spirit upon him."[18] (6) And you see how the Father's voice declares that there is an actual Son upon whom he is putting his Spirit. (7) Next the Only-begotten himself says, "Glorify thou me, Father, with the glory which I had

[15] 2,8–10 closely follows Hippol. C. Noet. 2–3.
[16] Rom 9:5.
[17] The first half of this sentence is paraphrased from Hippol. C. Noet. 3.
[18] Cf. Isa 42:1; Matt 12:18.

with thee before the world was."[19] But someone who says, "Father, glorify me," is not calling himself father; he knows that the "father" is his father. (8) And again, in another passage, "There came a voice from heaven, This is my Son; hear ye him."[20] And it did not say, "*I* am my Son, hear me," or again, "I have become a Son," but, "This is my Son; hear him."

3,9 And when he said, "I and the Father are one,"[21] he did not say, "I and the Father *am* one," but, "I and the Father *are* one."[22] "I and the Father," with the definite article, and with "and" in the middle, means that the Father is actually a father, and the Son actually a son.

4,1 And of the Holy Spirit, in turn, he says, "If I depart he shall come, the Spirit of truth."[23] This statement, "*I* am going and *he* is coming," is by far the clearest. Christ did not say, "*I* am going and *I* shall come," but with "I" and "he" showed that the Son is subsistent and the Holy Spirit is subsistent. (2) And again, "The Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father and receiveth of the Son"[24] is intended to show that the Father is subsistent, the Son is subsistent, and the Holy Spirit is subsistent. (3) And again, at the Jordan the Father spoke from above, the Son stepped into the Jordan, and the Spirit appeared between them in the form of a dove and came upon the Son, even though the Spirit had not taken flesh or assumed a body. (4) But to avoid giving the impression that the Spirit is identical with the Son, the Holy Spirit is portrayed in the form of a dove, to ensure the perception of the Spirit as truly subsistent. (5) But where else can I not find other arguments against these people who have infected themselves with insanity? If there is any truth in their notion, and in their worthless argument with no proof or force and no coherent reasoning or meaning, the scriptures will have to be discarded[25]—the scriptures, which on every page know the Father as a father, the Son as a son, and the Holy Spirit as a holy spirit.

4,6 But what do you mean, Mister? Can those who truly worship the Trinity be polytheists, the sons of the truth and of the only apostolic and catholic church? That is not so! (7) Who will not say that the God of truth is one, the Father almighty, the Source of the Only-begotten Son who is

---

[19] John 17:5.
[20] Matt 17:5.
[21] John 10:30.
[22] Hippolytus uses this argument at C. Noet. 9.
[23] Cf. John 16:7.
[24] John 15:26; 16:13; 14.
[25] ἀποβλητέαι, not an Epiphanian word. Epiphanius is paraphrasing Hippol. C. Noet. 3.

truly the divine Word, a Word subsistent, truly begotten of the Father without beginning and not in time? (8) Hence the church proclaims with certainty that God is one, a Father and a Son: "I am in the Father, and the Father in me, and we two are one"[26]—that is, one Godhead, one will, and one dominion.

4,9 From the Father himself the Spirit also proceeds—subsistent and truly perfect, the Spirit of truth, who enlightens all, who receives of the Son, the Spirit of the Father, the Spirit of Christ. (10) The church, then, knows one Godhead. There is one God, the Father of truth, a Father who is perfect and subsistent; and a Son who is a perfect Son and subsistent; and a Holy Spirit who is a perfect Holy Spirit and a subsistent—one Godhead, one sovereignty, one dominion. (11) Thus the sacred scriptures have everywhere plainly declared that God is one—that is, a co-essential Trinity, forever of the same Godhead, the same dominion.

4,12 And your brainless argument has collapsed, in all respects, Brainy! And now that this has been said, and in direct contradiction to Brainy's allegations, it is time to examine these from the beginning and to counter his propositions, as follows.[27]

5,1 First, since he advanced the proposition, " 'God is one, of whom are all things and we in him, and the Lord Jesus Christ is one, for whom are all things and we by him,' "[28] don't you see how, by saying, "God is one, of whom are all things and we for him?"[29] Paul is pointing out the oneness of the first principle so as not to direct attention to many first principles and lead men's minds, [already] deceived about the nonsense of polytheism, back to a plurality of gods. (2) For do you see how he has used one name and one title, but without denying the Only-begotten God? For he knows that he is Lord and knows that he is God; and he says, to certify this, "And one *Lord* Jesus Christ, by whom are all things."

5,3 However, by saying this of the Lord he did not mean that the Father and the Son are the same, but showed that the Father is truly a father and the Son truly a son. (4) For when he said "one God" of the Father, < he did > not < say it > to deny the Godhead of the Son. (For if the Son is not God he is not "Lord" either; but as he is "Lord," he is also God.) Though the holy apostle was compelled by the Holy Spirit to refer to one title, he

[26] John 14:10; 10:30.
[27] This transition is paraphrased from Hippol. C. Noet. 3.
[28] 1 Cor 8:6.
[29] 1 Cor 8:6.

explained the faith for us by stating clearly that Christ is "one Lord," and so must surely be God.

5,5 But because he says, "one," and [then] "one" [again, but does not say "one" a third time], no one need think that he has left the number of the Trinity unmentioned by failing to name the Holy Spirit. When he named the Father and the Son "God" and "Lord," he named them *in* the Holy Spirit. (6) For by saying, "*God* is one, of whom are all things," of the Father, he did not deny the Father's Lordship; nor, again, did he deny Christ's Godhead by saying, "and one Lord Jesus Christ" (7) As he was content with the one title in the Father's case, and said "one God" although it is plain that "Lord" is implied by "God"—so, in the case of the Son, he was content with "one Lord," but "God" is implied by "Lord." (8) Thus he did not jettison the Holy Spirit by mentioning [only] "Father" and "Son;" as I said, he spoke *in* the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit never < speaks* > in commendation of himself, or he might set us an example < of speaking* > of ourselves and commending < ourselves >. (9) Thus "God the Father, of whom are all things, is one, and the Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, is one." And the Holy Spirit is one, not different from God and still subsistent, because he is Spirit of God, Spirit of truth, Spirit of the Father, and Spirit of Christ.

6,1[30] But I suppose we also need to speak of "Egypt hath wearied, and the merchandise of the Ethiopians. And the lofty men of Saba shall pass over unto thee and be thy servants. They shall walk behind thee, bound with chains. They shall bow down to thee and pray through thee—for in thee is God and there is no God beside thee—For thou art God and we knew it not, O God, the God of Israel, the Savior."[31] (2) Noetus will say, "From so many texts that I've shown you, don't you see that God is one?" But not understanding what has been said, he villainously mutilates the scriptures, gives crooked explanations, cites the lines out of sequence and does not quote them consistently and exactly—he or the Noetians who stem from him—or expound them in order. (3) As some < will name > a bad dog "Leo," call the totally blind keen-sighted, and say that gall is candy—and as some have termed vinegar honey, and some have named the Furies the Eumenides—so it is with this man and his followers. (4) He has been named Brainy, but he is brainless as are his brainless followers, and he has no idea of the consequences of his statements and their asser-

[30] 6,1–2 closely follow Hippol. C. Noet. 4.
[31] Isa 45:14–15.

tions. To them the holy apostle's words, "Understanding neither what they say nor whereof they affirm,"[32] are applicable.

7,1[33] For you see what the sacred scriptures said earlier on, brothers, or rather, what the Lord himself said, as we read at the beginning of the passage. It is from this that we must explain the whole of the truth in the passage itself, and the whole of the subject of it. We read, (2) "Inquire of me concerning my sons and my daughters, and < concerning > the works of my hands command ye me. I made the earth and man upon it; with my hand I established the heavens. I gave commandment to all the stars; I raised up a king with righteousness, and all his paths are straight. He shall build my city and restore my captivity, not with ransoms nor with gifts; the Lord of hosts hath spoken."[34] (3) Only then does he say, "Egypt hath wearied and the merchandise of the Ethiopians," and so on [until] "that God is in thee."[35]

7,4 But in whom, should we say? In whom but the Father's Word? For the divine Word is truly the Son, and the Father is known in him, as he says, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father,"[36] and, "I have glorified thy name on the earth."[37]

7,5[38] Then again, "I have raised up a king."[39] Don't you see that this is the Father's own voice, which raised up the true Word from itself to be king over all—the Word truly begotten of him, without beginning and not in time? (6) And it raised him up again, this very king, as the holy apostle says, "If the Spirit of him that raised up Christ dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies."[40] (7) Thus the prophet's words agree with the apostle's, and the apostle's with the Gospels', and the Gospels' with the apostle's, and the apostle's with the prophet's; for Isaiah says, "I have raised up a king," and Paul says, "He that raiseth up Christ from the dead."

7,8[41] But the words, "God is in thee," < show > how mysteriously and marvelously the sacred scripture describes everything. The Godhead's

---

[32] 1 Tim 1:7.
[33] 7,1–4 closely follow Hippol C. Noet. 4.
[34] Isa 45:11–13.
[35] Isa 45:14.
[36] John 14:9, cf. Hippol. C. Noet. 4.
[37] John 17:4.
[38] 7,5–7a closely follow Hippol. C. Noet. 4.
[39] Isa 45:13.
[40] Rom 8:11.
[41] 7,8–10 are freely paraphrased from Hippol. C. Noet. 4.

< dwelling > in the flesh as in a temple was foreseen and foretold to the hope of mankind through its turning to God. (9) For the Son of God, the divine Word who dwells as God in his holy humanity and human nature as in a sacred city and holy temple, says of this holy temple, "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up."[42] (10) For < the > divine Word who has been sent from the Father in the flesh mystically reveals all things. To show a bond of spiritual love he embraced the flesh, shrinking himself despite his divine vastness—the Word himself, born of a virgin through the Holy Spirit; the Son of God who is one and has made himself one, in flesh and spirit, as the scripture says, "He that descended is the same also as he that ascended, the Son of Man who is in heaven."[43]

8,1[44] What will Brainy say, then, in his brainlessness? Was there flesh in heaven? Obviously not. Then how can the One who descended from heaven be the same as the One who ascended? This is meant to show that the Word who has come is not from below but has descended from on high, since he was made man in the flesh, not by a man's seed but by making his complete human nature of spirit and flesh. (2) And so, to show the oneness of the union of the Word and his manhood, he said that He who came from on high has ascended on high in the perfection of Godhead. (3) For now the Word, which once was not flesh but spirit, has been made flesh of the Spirit and the Virgin—He who was offered to the Father as a perfect Word, though before this, in heaven, he was not flesh.

8,4 What was the One who was in heaven, then, but the Word who was sent from heaven? To show that he was the same divine Word on earth and < in > heaven, changeless and unalterable, he possessed his oneness with the one Godhead, united with it by the Father's might. (5) For he was the Word, was God forever, was spirit, was might; and he adopted the name which was common and comprehensible to men, and was called Son of Man[45] though he was Son of God. (6) And the name was pronounced beforehand in the prophets because it was to apply to him, although it was not yet in the flesh. Thus Daniel said, "I saw one like unto a Son of Man coming upon the clouds."[46] (7) And the prophet was right to give the Word this name < when he was > in heaven, and call him whom he saw by the Holy Spirit Son of Man, since he observed the future before

---

[42] John 2:19.
[43] Cf. Eph 4:9; John 3:13.
[44] 8,1–7 closely follow Hippol C. Noet. 4.
[45] Cf. Hippol. C. Noet. 7.
[46] Dan 7:13.

its arrival and named the Word Son of Man before he was in the flesh. (8) And thus, putting the earlier event later, the Only-begotten says, "No man hath ascended up to heaven save he that came down from heaven, the Son of Man."[47] He did not mean that he was flesh in heaven but < that > he was to descend from heaven, and was to be known by this name.

9,1[48] But what is it that you're about to say, Mister? "'This is our God, and none can be accounted God besides him?'"[49] And that was quite right! The apostle too affirms it by saying, "Whose are the fathers and of whom, according to the flesh, came Christ, who is God over all."[50] Since Christ teaches us this himself by saying, "All things are delivered unto me of my Father,"[51] this makes him God over all. (2) And he expounds it marvelously: Christ is He Who Is (ὁ ὤν), God over all (ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός). (3) For John testifies to this by saying, "*That which was from the beginning*, which we have seen with our eyes and our hands have handled."[52] And again, in Revelation he says, "*He who is from the beginning* and is to come, the Almighty."[53] He was absolutely right; for when he said, "All things are delivered unto me of my Father," he appended <"the Father"> precisely as he should have. Though he is God over all, he has a Father of his own. And < this becomes apparent* > when he says, "I go unto my Father."[54] To which Father could he go, Brainless, if he were the Father himself?

10,1[55] Or again, he says, "That they may be one, as thou and I are one."[56] The scripture constantly guards against men's falls into extremes, and recalls their minds from all places to the middle way of the truth. (2) To those who think that the Son is different from the Father—I mean as Arius and other sects do—it says, "I and the Father are one."[57] (3) But to those who think that the Father and the Son are the same because it has said, "I and the Father are one," the scripture says, "Make *them* to be one as I and thou are one,"[58] shaming Noetus and his school by the reference to oneness of the disciples. (4) For how could Peter, John and

[47] John 3:13.
[48] 9,1–3 closely follows Hippol. C. Noet. 5.
[49] Bar 3:36.
[50] Rom 9:5.
[51] Matt 11:27.
[52] 1 John 1:1.
[53] Cf. Rev 1:8.
[54] John 20:17.
[55] 10,1–5 closely follow Hippol. C. Noet. 7.
[56] Cf. John 17:22.
[57] John 10:30.
[58] Cf. John 17:21–22. Hippolytus argues against Noetus from this text at C. Noet. 7.

the rest be identically one? But since he [is one with the Father] in one unity of Godhead and in purpose and power, < he indicated as much* >, to allay any suspicion that arises against the truth from either standpoint. (5) And the holy apostle Philip < witnesses to this* > by saying, "Show us the Father." And the Lord replied, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."[59] But he did not say, "*I am* the Father." (6) He meant himself when he said, "me," but did not mean himself when he said, "hath seen the Father." "The Father" is one thing, "me" is something else, and "I" is something else. (7) If he himself were the Father, he would say, "I am." But since he is not the Father himself but the Son, he truthfully says, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," to refute the blasphemy of Arius, which separates the Son from the Father.

10,8 And so, since every scripture has plainly laid down our way with regard to the truth, let us halt < here >. Along with the other sects we have maimed Noetus and his sect, I mean of Noetians, like the so-called agate dragon, which cannot turn either right or left when it pursues someone. (9) < And > since we have escaped his unsound teachings and his school's, let us give our attention to the rest by the power of God, to describe and refute the heretical sayings against the truth which they have invented.

Against Valesians.[1] *38, but 58 of the series*

1,1 I have often heard of Valesians, but have no idea who Vales < was >, where he came from, or what his sayings, admonitions or utterances < were >. (2) The name, which is Arabic, leads me to suppose that he and his sect are still in existence, as < I also > suspect—< for* >, as I said, < I cannot say this for certain* >—that there are some at Bacatha, in the land of Philadelphia beyond the Jordan. (3) The locals call them Gnostics, but they are not Gnostics; their ideas are different. But what I have learned about them is the following:

1,4 Most of them were members of the church until a certain time, when their foolishness became widely known and they were expelled from the church. All but a few are eunuchs, and they have the same beliefs about principalities and authorities that < the Sethians, Archontics* > and others do. (5) And when they take a man as a disciple, as long as he is still un-castrated he does not eat meat; but when they convince him of this, or

[59] John 14.8–9. Hippolytus argues against Noetus from this text at C. Noet. 7.

[1] This group is mentioned only by Epiphanius. His sources are clearly oral.

castrate him by force, he may eat anything, because he has retired from the contest and runs no more risk of being aroused to the pleasure of lust by the things he eats.

1,6 And not only do they impose this discipline on their own disciples; it is widely rumored that they have often made this disposition of strangers when they were passing through and accepted their hospitality. (7) They seize them [when they come] inside, bind them on their backs to boards, and perform the castration by force.

1,8 And this is what I have heard about them. Since I know where they live, and this name is well known in those parts and I have learned of no other name for the sect, I presume that this is it.

2,1 But these people are really crazy. If they mean to obey the Gospel's injunction, "If one of thy members offend thee, cut it off from thee. It is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of heaven halt or blind, or crippled"[2]—how can anyone be maimed in the kingdom? (2) For if the kingdom of heaven makes all things perfect, it can have no imperfection in it. And since the resurrection is a resurrection of the *body*, all the members will be raised and not one of them left behind. (3) And if any member is not raised, neither will the whole body be raised. And if just the one member that causes offense is left behind, none of the members will be raised at all, for they have all caused us to offend. (4) Who is going to tear his heart out? And yet the heart is the cause of offenses at every turn, for scripture says, "From within proceed fornication, adultery, uncleanness and such like."[3] All right, who will tear his heart out?

2,5 But if, in accordance with some people's stupidity and impiety, the body is not raised, how will this Valesian rule make any difference? If none of the members enter the kingdom of heaven, what further need is there to be short one member, when the others do not accomplish this? (6) But if the body is raised—and it is—how can there still be bodily mutilation in the kingdom of heaven? How can a kingdom of heaven containing bodies which are damaged not be unfit for the glory of its inhabitants? (7) And if the offending member must be cut off at all, then it has been cut off and not sinned! But if it has been cut off and not sinned, since it didn't sin it ought to rise first of all.

---

[2] Cf. Matt 5:29–30.
[3] Mark 7:21–22.

3,1 But by their audacity in performing this rash act they have set themselves apart and made themselves different from everyone. Because of what has been removed they are no longer men; and they cannot be women because that is contrary to nature.

3,2 Besides, the name of the contest's crown and prize has already been given, and these people will not appear in any of the three categories of eunuch the Lord has mentioned. (3) He says, "There are some eunuchs which were so born from their mother's womb."[4] Those eunuchs are not responsible for their condition, and certainly have no sin, because they were born that way. On the other hand there is nothing to their credit either, since they cannot do < anything like that >—I mean anything sexual—because they lack the divinely created organs of generation. (4) But neither can they have the kingdom of heaven as their reward for being eunuchs, since they have no experience of the contest. (5) Even though they have experienced desires, since they lack the ability to do what should not be done, neither do they have a reward for not doing it. They haven't done the thing, not because they didn't want to but because they couldn't. This is the way of the first type of eunuch the Lord mentions, the one that is born a eunuch. Because of their operation the Valesians cannot be any of these.

4,1 "And there are eunuchs," the Savior says, "which were made eunuchs of men." Valesians are none of these either. They—the eunuchs who are "made eunuchs of men"[5]—are made in the service of a king or ruler. (2) From jealousy and suspicion of their wives, some barbarian kings or despots take boys when they are only children and make eunuchs of them so that they can be entrusted with their wives, as I said, when they are grown. (3) And this has been the usual reason for these eunuchs. I imagine that this is < the origin of > the term, "eunuch." The "eunuch" can be "well-disposed" (εὐνοῦς) because his members have been removed, and with his organs removed he cannot have sexual relations. (4) So this is another category of eunuch, the kind that is taken in childhood and made eunuchs by men, but not for the kingdom of heaven's sake.

4,5 "And there be eunuchs," says the Savior, "which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake."[6] Who can these be but the noble apostles, and the virgins and monks after them? (6) John and

[4] Matt 19:12.
[5] Matt 19:12.
[6] Matt 19:12.

James, the sons of Zebedee, who remained virgin, surely did not cut their members off with their own hands, and did not contract marriage either; they engaged in the struggle in their own hearts, and admirably won the fame of the crown of this contest. (7) And all the millions after them who lived in the world without spouses and won the fame of this contest in monasteries and convents. They had no relations with women, but competed in the most perfect of contests.

4,8 So it is with Elijah in the Old Testament, and with Paul, who says, "To the unmarried I say that it is good for them if they remain even as I am; but if they cannot contain, let them marry."[7] (9) Now in what state did he "remain?" For if he had been a eunuch, and his imitators had remained like him in obedience to his "Remain as I"—how could a eunuch marry if he could no longer contain himself, in accordance with "Let them marry and not burn?"[8] You see that he is speaking of continence, not of the mutilation of one's members.

4,10 But if they claim to have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake, how can they distinguish themselves from [the case covered by] the text, "There are eunuchs which were made eunuchs of men?"[9] (11) For if one makes himself a eunuch with his own hands, he is a man, and his hands have done this infamous thing. And even though he could not do it himself but was made a eunuch by others, he still cannot be a eunuch "for the kingdom of heaven's sake" because he was "made a eunuch by men," whether by his own hand or the hand of others.

4,12 He will be deprived of his crown and prize as well, however, and have no further credit for abstaining from sexual relations. With the members which are needed for them removed, he cannot engage in them. (13) But for one who injures his own member, and one who cuts down another person's vineyard, the sentence is one and the same. He has not lived as God wills, but has conspired to rebel against his creator, the Lord and God.

4,14 But such a man will still feel desire. The eunuch in the sage's proverb is not exempt from desire, < but desires* > because he cannot gratify his desire, as it says, (15) "The desire of a eunuch to deflower a virgin."[10] And < their silliness has* > all < come to nothing* >. How much nonsense of all sorts has been invented in the world!

---

[7] 1 Cor 7:8–9.
[8] Cf. 1 Cor 7:9.
[9] Matt 19:12.
[10] Sir 20:4.

4,16 And this is what I know about them. And so, since I have spoken briefly of them and, as I said, believe that they are the ones, let us leave them behind and laugh at < them >, (17) like a two-stinged scorpion which is the opposite of its ancestors because it has horns and claws, and which, with its sting, resists the norm of God's holy church. Trampling them with firmly placed sandal—that is, with the Gospel's exact words—let us end our discussion of their foolishness here, and go on as usual to the rest.

Against the impure "Purists"[1] (*Cathari*). *39, but 59 of the series*

1,1 A group called the "Purists" arose after these, founded, as it is commonly said, by one Navatus.[2] Navatus was at Rome during the persecution which came before Maximian's—I believe it was Decius' then, or Aurelian's. (2) Because of those who had lapsed during the persecution he, along with his followers, became proud, would not communicate with persons who had repented after persecution, and adopted this heresy by saying that < such people > cannot be saved. There is one repentance, but no mercy for those who have fallen away and transgress after baptism.

1,3 We ourselves say that there is one repentance, and that this salvation comes through the laver of regeneration. But we do not ignore God's lovingkindness, (4) since we know the message of the truth, the Lord's mercy, nature's pardonability, the soul's fickleness, the weakness of the flesh, and the way everyone's senses teem with sins. "No man is sinless and pure of spot, not if he liveth even a single day upon the earth."[3]

1,5 Perfect penitence comes with baptism but if someone falls [afterwards] God's holy church does not lose him. She gives him a way back, and after repentance, reform. (6) For God said, "Thou hast sinned, be silent!"[4] to Cain, and the Lord told the paralytic, "Lo, thou art made whole; sin no more."[5] The Lord recalls Peter too after his denial, and in the place of the three denials, challenges him three times to confession—"Peter, lovest

---

[1] Pourkier (p. 382ff) suggests that Epiphanius' composition is based on Canon 8 of the Council of Nicaea (PG 137 261AB). Contemporary information about the Novatian schism, with which this Sect deals, is found at Cyprian of Carthage, Epp. 40–51 and Novatian's own Epistle, Clergy of Rome/Cyprian Ep. 30. Cf. also Eus. H. E. 6.43 (Dionysius of Alexandria); Basil of Caesarea Ep. 188, Canon 11; Ep. 190 Canon 47; Chrysost. Hom. 6 In Heb.

[2] Navatus was Novatian's sympathizer at Carthage, and the leader of the Novatianists there. Epiphanius' notice may be based on a faulty memory of Eus. H. E. 6.43.

[3] Job 14:4–5.

[4] Gen 4:7.

[5] John 5:14.

thou me? Peter, lovest thou me? Peter, lovest thou me?"—and says, "Feed my sheep."[6]

2,1 But the apostle's exact words are their downfall. He says, "It is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted the good word of God and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again to repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame. (2) For the earth which drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed, receiveth blessing. But that which beareth thorns and briers is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing; whose end is to be burned."[7] (3) And it is in fact impossible to renew those who have been renewed once and have fallen away. Christ cannot be born any more to be crucified for us, nor can anyone crucify again the not yet crucified Son of God. Nor can anyone receive a second baptism; there is one baptism, and one renewal. (4) But in order to heal the church and care for its members, the holy apostle at once prescribes their cure and says, "But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak. For God is not unrighteous to forget your good work."[8]

2,5 And you see how he has declared once and for all that there can be no second renewal; but he has not cut those who are still penitent off from salvation. Indeed, he has shown them the accompaniments to salvation, and that God is their helper because of their good works, and that he is the Lord of those who, even after transgressions, perform full penance and turn and reform.

2,6 The holy word and God's holy church always accept repentance, though not to weaken those who are finishing their course, or to make them lax; still, she does not block God's grace and lovingkindness, but knows the nature of every case. (7) For as one who has lost his virginity cannot < recover > it physically since nature does not permit this, so it is with one who has fallen into major sins after baptism. (8) And as one who has fallen from virginity has continence for a second dignity, so he who has fallen into major sin after baptism has < reform > for a second healing—not as virtuous as the first, but he has the second healing he has

[6] John 21:15; 16; 17.
[7] Heb 6:4–8.
[8] Heb 6:9–10.

received, one not thrust out from life. God's word, then, does not deny the reward of those who labor in penance.

3,1 And next, the same people have pressed on from this and invented some other things. For they too say that they have the same faith which we do, but they will not communicate with the twice-married.[9] For if someone marries a second wife after baptism, they never admit him again.

3,2 But this is perfectly silly. It is as though someone were to see a person swimming in the water, and plunge into the water without knowing how to swim, and drown because he had no experience or understanding of the technique of those who keep afloat with their hands and feet, but thought that the water simply buoys the man up without his own hands. (3) Or suppose that someone were to hear of a ruler punishing the doers of < evil > deeds right down to the smallest, and think that the same penalty applies to all, so that the punishment for murder is the same as the punishment for someone who slanders or has a < serious* > quarrel with his neighbor. (4) Or suppose that one were only a private citizen and saw someone with a governor's authority to punish criminals draw his sword against sorcerers and blasphemers or the impious, and after seeing people punished supposed that all are authorized to punish such guilt and chose to mimic the same behavior and kill people himself, supposedly judging malefactors. (5) But he would be arrested and punished himself, since he had no such authority from the emperor to do such things, and because he supposed that the same sentence applied to all by law, thus condemning himself to death as a wrongdoer through his own ignorance and lack of understanding. (6) The Purists have similarly lost everything by confusing everyone's duties. From not understanding the exact nature of God's teaching they have mistakenly taken another path, unaware that this[10] is not the tradition and following of the sacred scripture.

4,1 For they have assumed that what is enjoined upon the priesthood because of the preeminence of priestly service applies equally to everyone. They have heard, "The bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife, continent; likewise the deacon[11] and the presbyter," but not understood the limitation of the ordinances. (2) Since Christ's incarnation, in fact, because of the priesthood's superior rank, God's holy Gospel does not accept men for the priesthood after a first marriage, if they have remarried

---

[9] This prohibition, as well as the refusal of communion to penitent lapsees, is condemned by Canon 8 of the Council of Nicaea.

[10] Klostermann οὐχ αὕτη, MSS οὐκ αὐτή.

[11] 1 Tim 3:2; 6.

because their first wife died. And God's holy church observes this with unfailing strictness. (3) She does not even accept the husband of one wife if he is still co-habiting with her and fathering children. She does accept the abstinent husband of one wife, or a widower, as a deacon, presbyter, bishop and subdeacon, [but no other married men], particularly where the canons of the church are strictly enforced.[12]

4,4 But in some places, you will surely tell me, presbyters, deacons and sub-deacons are still fathering children [while exercising their office.] This is not canonical, but is due to men's occasional remissness of purpose, and because there is no one to serve the congregation.

4,5 Since, by the Holy Spirit's good appointment, the church always sees what is fittest, she knows to take great care that God's services be performed "without distraction,"[13] and that spiritual functions be fulfilled with the best disposition. (6) I mean that because of the functions and needs which arise unexpectedly, it is appropriate that the presbyter, deacon and bishop be free for God. (7) If the holy apostle directs even the laity to "give themselves to prayer for a time,"[14] how much more does he give this direction to the priest? I mean to be undistracted, leaving room for the godly exercise of the priesthood in spiritual employments.

4,8 But < this > can be tolerated < in > the laity as a concession to weakness—even remarriage after the first wife's death by those who cannot stop with the first wife.[15] (9) And the husband of [only] one wife is more highly respected and honored by all members of the church. But if the man could not be content with the one wife, who had died, < or > if there has been a divorce for some reason—fornication, adultery or something else—and the man marries a second wife or the woman a second husband, God's word does not censure them or bar them from the church and life, but tolerates them because of their weakness.[16] (10) The holy

[12] For other statements of the requirement of clerical continence see Eus. Demon. Ev. 1.9.31; Cyr. Cat. 12.25; Council of Elvira, Canon 26.

[13] 1 Cor 7:35.

[14] 1 Cor 7:5.

[15] Lay widows and widowers are permitted to remarry at Hermas Mand. 4.41; Clem. Alex. Strom. 3.84.2; after a period of continence at Council of Laodicea, Canon 1; Bas. Caes. Ep. 188, Canon 4.

[16] Because this apparently lax attitude toward divorce is surprising in Epiphanius, Riggi ("Nouvelle lecture") returns practically to the text of Petavius, though with some modifications: Καὶ ὁ μὲν μίαν ἐσχηκὼς ἐν ἐπαίνῳ μείζονι παρὰ πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐκκληζιαζομένοις ἐνυπάρχει. Οὐ [instead of ὁ] δὲ μὴ δυνασθεὶς τῇ μίᾳ ἀρκεσθῆναι τελευτησάσῃ. Ἕνεκεν τινὸς προφάσεως ἢ πορνείας ἤ μοιχείας ἤ κακῆς αἰτίας χωρισμοῦ γενομένου, συναφθέντα δευτέρᾳ γυναικί, ἡ [instead of ἤ] γυνὴ δευτέρῳ ἀνδρὶ οὐκ αἰτιᾶται, ὁ θεῖος λόγος οὐδ' ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας

word and God's holy church show mercy to such a person, particularly if he is devout otherwise and lives by God's law—not by letting him have two wives at once while the one is still alive, but < by letting > him marry a second wife lawfully if the opportunity arises, after being parted from the first.

4,11 [If this were not the case] the apostle would not tell the widows, "Let them marry, bear children, guide the house."[17] Nor, to the man who had his father's wife and had been delivered "to Satan for the destruction of the flesh that the spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord,"[18] would he say in turn, "Confirm your love toward him, lest such a one be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow."[19] (12) For he went on to say, 'To whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also. Therefore if I forgave anything, for your sakes forgave I it in the person of the Lord lest Satan should get an advantage over us. For we are not ignorant of his devices."[20] And see how he allows repentance even after a transgression.

5,1 And again the Lord says, "Forgive one another your trespasses, that your Father which is in heaven may also forgive you."[21] (2) Moreover, he says in another passage, "And I shall bewail many among you that have transgressed and not repented"[22] as though to intimate that, even though they have transgressed and repented, they are acceptable and will not be cast off. For the Lord knows what he will do with each.

5,3 And anyone can see that the rule of the truth is of this nature. After the first repentance through the laver of regeneration, by which repentance everyone is renewed, there is no second repentance of this sort. (4) For there are not two baptisms but one, Christ was not crucified twice but once, nor did he die for us and rise twice. And this is why we need to take care, or we may lose the crown of our renewal by transgression.

καὶ τῆς ζωῆς οὐκ ἀπολῃρύττει, ἀλλὰ διαβαστάζει διὰ τὸ ἀσθενές. "The husband of only one wife is held in higher respect and honor by all members of the church [but] not [if he] could not be content with the one wife who died. If there has been a divorce for some reason, for adultery, fornication, or an evil charge, the woman [who has married] a second husband cannot blame [her ex-husband] who has married a second wife. Neither does the word of God bar them from the church and life, but bears with their weakness." However, Epiphanius' scriptural citations at 4,11–5,2 suggest that leniency is indeed his point, and stylistically, abrupt asyndeta in this sort of context are unusual in Epiphanius.

17 1 Tim 5:14.

18 Cf. 1 Cor 5:1; 5.

19 2 Cor 2:8; 7.

20 2 Cor 2:10.

21 Matt 6:14; Mark 11:25.

22 2 Cor 12:21.

(5) But if someone does transgress and is "overtaken in a fault," as the apostle says, "ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted."[23] If, then, if anyone is overtaken < in > a fault, no matter which, let him repent. (6) God accepts repentance even after baptism, if one falls away. How he deals with such a person, he alone knows—"Unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out."[24] (7) We must not judge before the [second] advent, "until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and then the praise of every man will be manifest",[25] "For the day will declare it, for it is revealed in fire."[26]

6,1 Thus to those who have sinned after baptism we neither promise freedom unconditionally, nor deny them life. For God is "merciful and pitiful,"[27] and "hath given a way of return to the penitent."[28] (2) The first is plain; as for the second, we know that God is merciful, if we repent of our transgressions with our whole souls. He holds life, salvation and lovingkindness in his hand, and what he does is known to him alone; but no one can lose by repentance, and no one who repents of all his faults has been refused.

6,3 How much more, surely, [must this apply to] one who is lawfully married to a second wife! The first wife is a divine ordinance; the second, a concession to human weakness. And even if one marries a further wife [after the second], his weakness is still tolerated. (4) For scripture says, "A wife is bound by law so long as her husband liveth. But if her husband be dead she is at liberty to be married to whom she will, < only in the Lord >."[29] Scripture declares her unquestionable freedom from sin [if she remarries] after her husband's death, and with its addition, < that is* >, "in the Lord," sets < the limit* > [to this] freedom. (5) Thus the woman is not cut off from the Lord if she marries another husband after her husband's death; nor is the man if he marries a second wife after his wife's death—"only in the Lord," as the apostle says. (6) And he indeed says, "But she is happier if she so abide,"[30] < but he does not command this. He does, however, command* >, "in the Lord." And this means, "not in

[23] Gal 6:1.
[24] Rom 11:33.
[25] 1 Cor 4:5.
[26] 1 Cor 3:13.
[27] Ps 110:4; 111:4.
[28] Sir 17:24.
[29] 1 Cor 7:39.
[30] 1 Cor 7:40.

fornication, adultery or an illicit love affair, but with a good will, openly, in lawful wedlock, abiding by the faith, the commandments, good works, piety, fastings, good order, almsdeeds, zeal, the doing of good. (7) When these accompany and remain with them, they do not render them worthless or unfruitful at the Lord's coming.

6,8 The priesthood ranks first and has the strictest requirements in everything, but moderation and forbearance are shown the laity, so that all may be taught and all shown mercy. (9) For the Lord is merciful, and mighty to save all, by their orderliness and true faith in the purity of the gospel. For he alone is pure. (10) These people who call themselves "pure" make themselves impure on just these grounds; whoever declares himself pure has condemned himself outright for impurity.

7,1 It is the height of stupidity for persons of this sort to suppose that they can pass such a judgment on the entire laity for one thing—even if it were true. But we should realize that no soul is charged for this reason alone. And < one does not > become virtuous in this way alone, (2) but also by not being abusive; not swearing any oath true or false but saying, "Yea, yea," and, "Nay, nay", not being treacherous, not slandering, not stealing, not trafficking. (3) The filth of our sins accumulates from all of these, for "As a peg will be sharpened between two stones," says scripture, "so will sin between buyer and seller."[31] (4) And < who can doubt* > that, out of the whole body of Purists, < some > < must be* > drunkards, traffickers, covetous, or usurers? [Who can doubt] that < they too >, surely, have such faults and others like them, < and > and that lies too follow in the wake of each? (5) How can they call themselves pure, as though, for this one reason, they were assured of the full divine forgiveness of all their faults? They have not learned the precise interpretation of the Gospel, or for whom it has reserved this strict rule against second marriage.

7,6 Those too who have fallen away through persecution, if they accept full penance, sitting in sackcloth and ashes and weeping before the Lord—the Benefactor has the power to show mercy even to them. No ill can come of repentance.

7,7 Thus the Lord and his church accept the penitent, as Manasseh the son of Hezekiah returned and was accepted by the Lord—and the chief of the apostles, St. Peter, who had denied for a time (8) and has [still] became our truly solid rock which supports the Lord's faith, and on which the church is in every way founded. (9) This is, first of all, because he

[31] Sir 12:24.

confessed that "Christ" is "the Son of the living God,"[32] and was told, "On this rock of sure faith will I build my church"[33]—for he plainly confessed that Christ is true Son. For by saying, "Son of the living God," with the additional phrase, "the living," he showed that Christ is God's true Son, as I have said in nearly every Sect.

8,1 Peter also assures us of the Holy Spirit by saying to Ananias, "Why hath Satan tempted you to lie to the Holy Ghost? Ye have not lied unto man, but unto God,"[34] for the Spirit is of God and not different from God. (2) And Peter also became the solid rock of the building and foundation of God's house, because, after denying, turning again, and being found by the Lord, he was privileged to hear, "Feed my lambs and feed my sheep."[35] (3) For with these words Christ led us to the turning of repentance, so that our well founded faith might be rebuilt in him—a faith that forbids the salvation of no one alive who truly repents, and amends his faults in this world.

9,1 Thus the bride herself said to the bridegroom in the Song of Songs, "My sister's son answereth and saith unto me, Arise and come, beloved, my fair one, my dove, for the storm is past"—the horrid darkness of the overcast sky is past, and the great frightfulness < of the storms* >, as it were, < of our sins* >—(2) "and the rain is over and gone. The flowers appear in our land, the time of pruning has come, the voice of the turtle-dove is heard in our land. The fig tree putteth forth her fruits. Our vines blossom, they have yielded their fragrance."[36] (3) She means that all the past is behind us. Spring is now in bloom, the sea is calm and the fear of rain is past. The old < shoots* > of the vine have been cut off, the grass is no longer merely green but in flower as well, (4) and the voice of the Gospel has cried out "in the wilderness"[37]—that is, "in our land." The fig tree, which once was cursed, has borne "figs"—the fruits of repentance, now visible in its twigs and branches—and "vines,"[38] now in bloom with the fragrant message of the faith of the Gospel.

9,5 For Christ has even now called his bride and said, "Arise and come!"[39] "Arise," < that is >, from the death of sins, "and come" in righteousness.

---

[32] Matt 16:16.
[33] Cf. Matt 16:18.
[34] Acts 5:3–4.
[35] John 21:16; 17.
[36] Cant 2:10; 13.
[37] Mark 1:3.
[38] ἀμπέλους. Because the vines twine on the fig trees planted in the vineyards?
[39] Cant 2:10; 13.

"Arise" from transgression "and come" with confidence. "Arise" from sins "and come" with repentance. "Arise" from palsy "and come" whole; "arise" from maiming "and come" sound; "arise" from unbelief "and come" in faith. "Arise" from the lost "and come" with the found.

9,6 But since the sacred oracle knew that men can fall into many transgressions after their first repentance, first call and, as it were, first healing, the bridegroom, again, says, "Arise and come, my beloved, my fair one, my dove, and come, thou my dove!"[40] (7) He calls her this second time and not simply once. But the second time is not like the first, for in the previous call he says, "Arise and come, beloved, my fair one, my dove." The first time it is, "Arise and come," and not, "Come *thou*." (8) And the second time he adds the article[41] to show that his call is not a second call, changed after the first, but the same divine right hand of lovingkindness [that was offered] in the first, extended once more after [there have been] transgressions.

9,9 "And come, < thou > my dove," he says, "in the shelter of the rock, nigh unto the outworks."[42] "In the shelter of a rock"—< that is >, in Christ's lovingkindness and the Lord's mercy, for this is the shelter of the rock, the shelter of hope, faith and truth. (10) [And] "nigh unto the outworks" means before the closing of the gate—before the king has gone inside the walls and admits no one further. In other words, after our departure and death, when there is no more "nigh unto the outworks," the gates are closed, and amendment is no more.

10,1 For in the world to come, after a man's departure, there is no opportunity to fast, no call to repentance, no giving of alms. There are no blameworthy deeds either—no war, adultery, licentiousness—but neither is there righteousness and repentance. (2) As the seed cannot thicken or be blasted by the wind after the reaping of the ear, so < after a man's death there can be no increase of his store* > and nothing else of benefit to him. (3) But don't tell me about the things that spoil the store, that is, the worms and moths. Scripture does say this of things in eternity; but the point of comparison, and what we lock away behind gates and store safely in a barn, is a symbol and type of faith, [which is kept] "where neither thieves break through nor moths corrupt,"[43] as God's word says.

---

[40] Cant 2:13–14.

[41] I.e., the article specifies this call as *the* call issued to the same person who has already been called.

[42] Cant 2:14.

[43] Matt 6:20.

Thus < there is no decrease of our store* > after death, but neither, certainly, is there opportunity for godliness, nor, as I said, < call > to repentance. (4) For Lazarus does not go to the rich man in the next world, nor does the rich man go to Lazarus. Nor does Abraham inconvenience the poor man who has since become rich, and send him [to the rich man]. And the rich man who has become poor does not obtain his request, though he begs and pleads with the merciful Abraham. (5) The storehouses had been sealed, the time was up, the contest finished, the ring emptied, the prizes awarded, and the contestants at ease. Those who have failed have left, those who did not fight have no more chance, those who were worsted in the ring have been ejected. All is plainly over after our departure.

10,6 But while all are in the world there is arising even after a fall, there is still hope, still a remedy, still confession—even if not for everyone, still < by those who are repenting for the second time* >. And surely < even > the salvation of the others is not ruled out.

11,1 Now every sect which has drifted away from the truth in the dark is blind and shortsighted, thinking of one idea after another. For these people are like simpletons who do not understand the character, purpose and proper dress of any member of the body. (2) In a way—(what I propose to say is ridiculous, < but > it bears a resemblance to their stupidity)—they put their shoes on their heads but their wreaths on their feet, and golden collars round their tummies. And they wind what we might call our other footgear, which we have because we wear himatia and which some call drawers or pants, around their hands, but put rings on their feet.

11,3 The regulation of these ignorant people is just as mistaken and clumsy. They have assumed that the prohibitions of second marriages and the rest, which are reserved for the priesthood, < are enjoined* > upon all the laity; and they have attributed the particularly stringent injunctions, which God has made to keep certain persons from straying through laxity, to cruelty on God's part. (4) It is as though one were to tear a sleeve off an himation and cover himself only to the elbow or to what is called the wrist, but always hold the sleeve in front of his eyes and jeer at the rest, without noticing that his whole body was bare. (5) So these people pride themselves on not receiving the twice-married, but < make light of > all the commandments that are like this and much finer in the keeping, but deadly if not kept. They < needlessly* > forbid the one [sin], but have ignored the others. (6) Forgetting that their whole bodies are bare, they have ceased to obey all the ordinances, and disingenuously retained the one.

12,1 How much nonsense people can think of! Every pretext, however trivial it was, has drawn each sect away from the truth and impelled it

to a prolific production of evils. (2) It is < as though > one found a break in a wall beside a highway, thought of going through it, left the road and turned off < there >, in the belief that a place where he could turn and pick the road up again was right close by. But he did not know that the wall was very high and ran on for a long way; (3) he kept running into it and not finding a place to get out, and in fact went for more than a signpost, or mile, further without reaching the road. And so he would turn and keep going, tiring himself out and finding no way to get back to his route; and perhaps he could never find one unless he went back through the place where he had come in. (4) So every sect, as though it meant to find a shortcut, has come to grief because of the length of the journey, and its entanglement with ignorance and stupidity has become an unbreachable barrier for it. (5) And no such sect can reach the true road unless each one turns back to the original of the road, that is, to the king's highway. (6) The Law declared this in so many words, when the holy man, Moses, said to the king of Edom, "Thus saith thy brother Israel. I shall pass by thy borders to the land which the Lord hath sworn to our fathers to give us, a land flowing with milk and honey, the land of the Amorites, the Perizites, the Girgashites, the Jebusites, the Hivites, the Canaanites and the Hittites. (7) We shall not swerve to the right hand or to the left, we shall drink water for money and eat food for money. We shall not swerve this way or that, we shall go by the king's highway."[44] (8) For there is a king's highway, and this is the church of God and the journey of the truth. But each of these sects which has abandoned the king's highway, turned to the right or to the left, and ended by getting more lost, will be drawn out of its way, and will never reach the end of the wrong road of its error.

13,1 Now then, servants of God and sons of God's holy church, you who know the sure standard and are on the path of the truth! Let's not be drawn in the wrong direction by voices, and led away by the voice of every false practice. (2) For their roads are perilous, and the path of their false notion runs uphill. They talk big, and don't know even the little things; they promise freedom, but are the slaves of sin themselves. They boast of the greater things, and have not even attained to the lesser.

13,3 But I think that this will be enough about these so-called "Pure" people—who, if the truth must be told, are impure people. (4) Let us toss this sect aside like the face of a basilisk—which, from the sound of the name, has a very grand title, (βασίλισκος) but which it is death to meet. But let us, striking it with the power of the wood of the cross, set out

[44] Cf. Nu 20:14; 17; 19; Deut 7:1.

once more for the rest, (5) offering God the same supplication that he will travel with us, abide with us, be with us, assist us, preserve us, chasten us, and make us worthy to speak the truth, so that we may not tell any falsehoods ourselves and thus fall into the same state as the sects, which have taught the world nothing true.

13,6 And further, the people in Africa and Byzicania who are named Donatists for one Donatus, have ideas similar to these and are rebels themselves because, if you please, they will not communicate with those who have lapsed in the persecution. They will be refuted by the same arguments as the Navatians, or so-called Purists, who are unequally yoked with them. (7) I therefore do not need to discuss them any further, but have put them together with those who are like them. (8) However, these latter have fallen again in a more serious way. They believe in the Arian version of the faith and, as Arius was refuted, they likewise will be refuted by words of truth about the faith which they hold incorrectly; for Arius agrees with them and they with him. (9) And once more, we shall pass this sect by as though we had trampled on horrid serpents in the Lord, and go on to the rest.

Against Angelics. 40, but 60 of the series

1,1 I have heard that < there is* > a sect of Angelics and have been told nothing but their name. But I am not sure which sect this is, perhaps because it arose at some time, but later dwindled away and was altogether brought to an end.

1,2 But why it got its name I don't know. It may have been because of some people's saying that the world was made by angels—even if it was given this name for saying that, I can't say [so for certain.] Or it may have been because they boasted of having the rank of angels and leading particularly exemplary lives—I cannot make this affirmation either. Or they might even have been named for some place; there is a country called Angelina beyond Mesopotamia.

2,1 But if you are reminded of something now, reader, you will harbor no suspicion to my discredit. I promised to report the roots and the nourishment of some sects, or some of the things they do, but to mention only the name of others[1]; (2) but as the divine power has equipped and

[1] See Proem II 2,4. But there Epiphanius does not speak of mentioning some sects only by name.

aided me, until this sect I have gone right through them all and left none unexplained, except this one. (3) But perhaps it is because it was puffed up with pride for a short while and later came to an end, that I have no understanding of it.

2,4 But I shall name it with the mere quick mention of its name as though as that of an untimely birth, pass its place [in the series] by, and embark on the investigation of the others. (5) I likewise entreat the Lord of all to disclose himself to me, show my small mind what the sects do, and give it all the exact facts, (6) enabling me to correct myself and my neighbors so that we may avoid what is evil, but gain a firm foundation, in God, in what is good, and absolutely true.

Against Apostolics. 41,[1] *but 61 of the series*

1,1 Others after these have termed themselves Apostolics. They also like to call themselves Apotactics, since they practice the renunciation of possessions. (2) They too are an offshoot of the doctrines of Tatian, the Encratites, the Tatianists and the Purists, and they do not accept marriage at all. Their mysteries also have been altered.[2]

1,3 They boast of supposedly owning nothing, but they divide and harm God's holy church to no purpose and have been deprived of God's lovingkindness by their self-chosen regulations. (4) For they allow no readmission if one of them has lapsed, and as to matrimony and the rest, they agree with the sects we mentioned above. (5) And the Purists use only the canonical scriptures, but these people rely mostly on the so-called Acts of Andrew and Thomas, and have nothing to do with the ecclesiastical canon.

1,6 [But they are wrong]; for if marriage is abominable, all < who > are born of marriage are unclean. And if God's holy church is composed only of those who have renounced marriage, (7) marriage cannot be of God. And if it is not, the whole business of procreation is ungodly. And if the

[1] Though several authors speak of Apotactics, only Epiphanius uses the term, Apostolics 2,1 suggests that he has one particular group, in a specific geographical area, in mind. Other authors tend to give such rigorist groups several related titles: "Encratites, Apotactics and Eremites" (Mac. Mag. 3.43); "Cathari, Encratites, Hydroparastatae and Apotactics" (Bas. Caes. Ep. 199, Canon 7); "Encratites, Saccophori and Apotactics" (Code of Theodosius 16.5.7) et al. Below at 1,2 Epiphanius says, "Encratites, Tatianists and Cathari"; at 7,1, "Apostolics, Apotactics and Encratites."

[2] This presumably means that they celebrated the eucharist with water instead of wine.

business of procreation is ungodly so are they, since they have been begotten by such behavior.

1,8 But what becomes of scripture's, "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder?"[3] < To satisfy > the necessities < of nature >[4] is human, but voluntary continence displays, not the work of man but the work of God. (9) And the necessity of nature [indeed] is often blameworthy because the necessity is not satisfied in a praiseworthy manner, but has overstepped the rule. For godliness is not a necessity; righteousness is by choice.

1,10 The things which by their nature must necessarily < contribute* > to godliness are obvious, and these are over and above nature. For example, not committing fornication, not committing adultery, not being licentious, not having two spouses at once, not plundering, not being unjust, not getting drunk, not being gluttonous, not worshiping idols, not committing murder, not practicing sorcery, not cursing, not reviling, not swearing, being annoyed and quickly appeased, not sinning when angered, not letting the sun go down on one's wrath. (11) But that lawful wedlock < is godly* >, nature, which God has created and permitted, will show; and the other things of this sort have each their measure of permission.

2,1 But as I have previously said of them, they live in a small area, around Phrygia, Cilicia and Pamphylia. (2) Now what does this mean? Has the church, which reaches from one end of the earth to the other, been exterminated? Will "Their sound is gone out unto all lands, and their words unto the ends of the world,"[5] no longer hold? Or is the Savior's "Ye shall be witnesses unto me unto the uttermost part of the earth"[6] no longer in force? (3) If marriage is not respectable, godly and worthy of eternal life, they < themselves* > should be born without marriage. But if they are born of marriage, they are unclean because of marriage. (4) If, however, they alone are not unclean even though they are the products of marriage, then marriage is not unclean—for no one will ever be born without it. (5) And there is a great deal of human error which harms humanity in various ways and for many reasons, and which, by pretense, leads everyone astray from the truth.

3,1 The church too believes in renunciation, but it does not consider marriage unclean. It also believes in voluntary poverty, but it does not

---

[3] Matt 19:6.
[4] Holl τὸ . . . ἐπανάγκες <τῆς φύσεως ἐπιτελεῖν>, MSS τὸ . . . ἐπανάγκες χωρίζειν.
[5] Ps 18:5.
[6] Acts 1:8.

look down on those who are in righteous possession of property, and have inherited enough from their parents to suffice for themselves and the needy. (2) Many [Christians] have enough to eat, but they are not contemptuous of those who do not. "Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not, and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth. For to the Lord he eateth and drinketh, and to the Lord he eateth and drinketh not."[7] (3) And you see that there is one harmony, one hope in the church and one faith, granted each in accordance with his ability and his own laborious struggle.

3,4 God's holy church is like a ship. However, a ship is not made of one kind of wood, but of different kinds. Its keel is made of one kind of wood, though not all in one piece, and its anchors < of > another. Its beams, planks and ribs, its frame-timbers, the stern, sides and cross-rods, the mast and the steering paddles, the seats and the oar-handles, the tillers and all the rest, are an assemblage of different kinds of wood. (5) But since each is made of only one kind of wood, none of these sects exhibits the character of the church.

God's holy church holds marriage sacred and honors married persons, for "Marriage is honorable and the bed undefiled."[8] (6) < But > it regards continence as the most admirable, and commends it because it is engaged in the contest and has despised the world, as being still more powerful [than the world]. And the church believes in virginity and accords it the highest honor, because it is a thing of virtue and is fitted with the lightest wing. (7) The church has members who have renounced the world and yet are not contemptuous of those who are still in the world; they rejoice in the very great piety of such persons, as did the apostles who owned nothing themselves, < and yet did not look down on the others* >. (8) And the Savior himself owned no earthly possessions when he came in the flesh, though he was Lord of all—and yet he did not reject the women who assisted his disciples and himself. The Gospel says, "women which followed him from Galilee, ministering unto him of their substance."[9]

4,1 [If no one may own property], what is the point of "Hither to my right hand, ye blessed, for whom my heavenly Father hath prepared the kingdom before the foundation of the world. For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat; thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was naked, and ye

[7] Rom 14:3.
[8] Heb 13:4.
[9] Luke 8:3.

clothed me?"[10] (2) How could they do these things except with [the fruits of] their honest labor, and their righteously acquired possessions?

4,3 And if these people < who > have made their own renunciation and live like the apostles would mix with the rest [of us], their ways would not seem strange, or foreign to God's ordinance. (4) And if they renounced wives for the sake of continence their choice would be praiseworthy, provided that they did not call marriage unclean, and provided that they treated the < still > married as comrades, knowing the limitation and the rank of each.

4,5 For God's ship takes any passenger except a bandit. If it finds that someone is a robber and bandit it does not take him on board—or one who is a fugitive and in rebellion against his owners. (6) Thus God's holy church does not accept fornication, adultery, the denial of God, and those who defy the authority of God's ordinance and his apostles. (7) But it takes the man on important business, the experienced seaman—the pilot and < helmsman* >, the bow lookout, the man in the stern (the one most used to command), the one who knows something of cargo and lading—and someone who simply wants to cross the ocean without drowning. (8) And there is no question of the ship's not providing safety for someone who does not have a particular amount of property; it knows how to save all, and each in his own profession. Why are the members of Caesar's household greeted in the Epistles? (9) Why the apostle's "If any man think that he behaveth himself uncomely toward his virgin, and need so require, let her marry; she sinneth not."[11]

4,10 But "sinneth not" cannot apply to him without baptism. For if "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God, being justified freely by his grace,"[12] this is plainly through the laver of regeneration. For baptism has adorned the soul and the body, washing every sin away through repentance. (11) Thus the gift of baptism both enfolds the virgin and, because of her sinfulness, hastens to seal the non-virgin.

5,1 But though I have said that the apostle directed the virgin to marry, no one need get the silly notion that he gave this direction to dissuade the woman from her course once she had vowed virginity to God. (2) He did not mean these women, but marriageable women who had remained

[10] Matt 25:24–35.
[11] 1 Cor 7:36.
[12] Rom 3:23–24.

virgins in their prime, not for virginity's sake but because they of their inability to find husbands.

5,3 The apostles, who were Jewish and had begun their preaching after lives lived by the Law, were still bound by the provisions of the Law, not for any fleshly justification but out of regard for the Law's fitting sureness and strictness. (4) The Law admirably forbade the Israelites to give their daughters to gentiles, who might seduce them into idolatry. Thus a believer at that time was ordered not to give his virgin daughters to Jews any longer, but to Christians, whose beliefs and opinions were the same as theirs.

5,5 But as the Gospel was new there was not yet a large number of Christians in every place, and not a great deal of Christian teaching. Hence the fathers of virgin daughters would keep their virgins at home for a long time if they could not give them to Christians, and when they were past their prime they would fall into fornication from the necessity of nature. (6) So, because the apostle saw the harm that resulted from this strictness, he permitted [marriage to Jews], and said, "he who would < give > his virgin in marriage"[13]—and he did not say, "*his own* virgin," for he was not speaking of the man's own body, (7) but of the father guarding a virgin [daughter]. But even if "his virgin" means his own body, there is nothing to prevent [the man from giving his daughter]. (8) Thus he says, "< He > that standeth steadfast in his intention and ought so to do, let her marry! She sinneth not"[14] "Let her marry anyone she can; she is not sinning." (9) And this is why < he says >, "Art thou bound unto a wife? Seek not to be loosed. Art thou loosed from a wife? Seek not a wife."[15] The apostle who says, "I would that all men be even as I,"[16] also < said >, "If they cannot contain, let them many."[17]

6,1 And again, when he was urging the < un >married [to remain so], he said, "I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I."[18] (2) But then how could he go on to say, "Art thou bound unto a wife? Seek not to be loosed?"[19] Why will he not be guilty of

[13] Cf. 1 Cor 7:36.
[14] Cf. 1 Cor 7:37; 36.
[15] 1 Cor 7:27.
[16] 1 Cor 7:7.
[17] 1 Cor 7:9.
[18] 1 Cor 7:8.
[19] 1 Cor 7:27.

contradicting his Lord, who said, "Whoso forsaketh not father and mother and brethren, and wife and sons and daughters, is not my disciple?"[20]

6,3 But if Christ means that one must forsake his lawful wife, and his father, how can he himself say in turn, "He that honoreth father or mother, this is the first commandment with a promise attached"[21] and, "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder?"[22]

6,4 However, none of the sacred words need an allegorical interpretation of their meaning; they need examination, and the perception to understand the force of each proposition. (5) But tradition must be used too, for not everything is available from the sacred scripture. Thus the holy apostles handed some things down in scriptures but some in traditions, as St. Paul says, "As I delivered the tradition to you,"[23] and elsewhere, "So I teach, and so I have delivered the tradition in the churches,"[24] and, "If ye keep the tradition in memory, unless ye have believed in vain."[25] (6) God's holy apostles, then, gave God's holy church the tradition that it is sinful to change one's mind and marry after vowing virginity. And yet the apostle wrote, "If the virgin marry she hath not sinned."[26] (7)[27] How can the one agree with the other? By that virgin he does not mean the one who had made a vow to God, but < the one on whom* > virginity has been forced by the scarcity, at that particular time, of men who believe in Christ.

6,8 And that this is the case the same apostle will teach us by saying, "Younger widows refuse. For when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry, having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith."[28] (9) If even a woman who has been widowed after knowing the world will be condemned for abandoning her first faith because she has vowed to God and then married, how much more will a virgin, if she marries after devoting herself to God without having known the world? (10) < For > why has she, indeed, not waxed far more wanton against Christ, and abandoned the greater faith? Why will she not be condemned for relaxing her own godly resolution?

---

[20] Cf. Luke 14:26.
[21] Eph 6:2.
[22] Matt 19:6.
[23] Matt 19:6.
[24] Cf. 1 Cor 11:2; 7:17.
[25] 1 Cor 15:2.
[26] Cf. 1 Cor 7:36.
[27] We supply a paragraph number missing from Holl.
[28] 1 Tim 5:11–12.

7,1 "Let them marry, bear children, guide the house"[29] is a concise and temperate retort to those who think evil of every disposition in the church's tradition. (2) It is the repudiation of those who call themselves Apostolics, Apotactics and Encratites; also of the soft-headed churchmen who persuade women to shirk the running of a full course, refusing to finish the race because of its length. (3) And whoever repudiates virginity for God's sake and dishonors the contest, is a sinner and liable to judgment. If an athlete cheats in a game he is flogged and put out of the contest; and anyone who cheats on virginity is ejected from a race, crown and prize of such importance.

7,4 But judgment, not condemnation, is the better alternative. Those who do not commit their fornication < openly > for fear of being shamed before men, < but > do it in secret, < have a further sin because* > they do this < under the pretense > of virginity, monogamy or continence. (5) < For > they do not have to confess to men—but they do to God, who knows secrets and at his coming convicts all flesh of its sins. (6) It is better, then, to have the one sin and not further sins. If one drops out of the race it is better to take a lawful wife openly, and in place of virginity do penance for a long time, and be readmitted to the church as one who has strayed and wept, and is in need of reinstatement—and not be wounded every day by the secret darts of wickedness which the devil launches at him.

8,1 This is what the church knows how to preach. These are her healing medicines. These are the kinds of unguents she prepares. This is the compounding of the holy oil in the Law. This is the fine faith with its sweet fragrance which steels the athlete for the contest, reminding him that, to be crowned, he must stay the course. (2) And this is the work of God, gathering all things for royal disposition: purple from the sea, wool from the flock, linen from the earth and flax and silk, skins dyed scarlet and precious stones, emeralds, pearls, agates—stones of different colors but of equal value. (3) Gathering gold, silver, petrified wood, bronze and iron, moreover, and not disdaining goat skins. (4) And this was the tabernacle of those days; but now, in place of the tabernacle, there is the house made firm in God, founded on the power < of the truth* >. And every sect should stop attacking the truth, or rather, stop driving itself away from the truth.

[29] 1 Tim 5:14.

8,5 And let this be enough. I have struck this haughty viper with the wood of the cross and left it dead, like the quick-darting snake, as they call it, or the blind-snake or mouser. These snakes do not have as much venom, but they may well be compared with the Apostolics as nuisances because of their movement, pride and stroke. Let us disdain them, beloved, and go on to the rest.

Against Sabellians.[1] *42, but 62 of the series*

1,1 Sabellius did not arise very long ago in ancient times, for his date is recent. The so-called Sabellians are derived from him. (2) He < taught > very similarly to the Noetians, except for a few further doctrines of his own. (3) Many in Mesopotamia[2] and Rome are of his persuasion, due to some stupidity of theirs.

1,4 For he, and the Sabellians who derive from him, hold that the Father is the same, the Son is the same, and the Holy Spirit is the same, so that there are three names in one entity.[3] (5)[4] Or, as there are a body, a soul and a spirit in a man, so the Father, in a way, is the body; the Son, in a way, is the soul; and as a man's spirit is in man, so is the Holy Spirit in the Godhead. (6) Or it is as in the sun, which consists of one entity but has three operations, I mean the illumining, the warming, and the actual shape of the orb. (7) The warming, or hot and seething operation is the Spirit; the illumining operation is the Son; and the Father is the actual form of the whole entity.[5] (8) And the Son was once sent forth like a ray, accomplished the entire dispensation of the Gospel and men's salvation in the world, and was taken up to heaven again, as though a ray had been sent by the sun and had returned to the sun. (9) But the Holy Spirit is sent into the world both once and for all, and in the individual case of each person so privileged. He quickens this person and makes him fervent, and,

[1] The source of this is plainly literary, see the time reference in 1,1 and the style of what follows. A possibility is some lost work of Dionysius of Alexandria, see Eus. H. E. 6.6. Sabellius is attacked at Hippol. Haer. 9.3.11–13.5.4.

[2] The Mesopotamian archbishop Archelaus mentions Sabellius as a heretic, Act. Arch. 41.

[3] The same phraseology is attributed to Sabellius by Dionysius of Alexandria apud Athanasius, De Sententiis Dionysii (Routh III p. 375).

[4] We supply a paragraph number not found in Holl.

[5] Roughly the same comparison is made at Justin Dial. 128.5; Tert. Adv. Prax. 10.4.

as it were, warms and heats him by the power of the Spirit and his communion with him.[6] And these are their doctrines.

2,1 They use all the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, but [especially] certain texts which they select themselves in keeping with the idiocy and stupidity of their own which they have introduced. (2) First, God's words to Moses, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God, the Lord is one."[7] "Thou shalt not make to thyself other gods."[8] "There shall not be unto thee new gods,"[9] for "I am God, the first and the last, and beside me there is no other."[10] (3) And whatever of this sort < they find, < they alter* > to suit themselves, and advance it as proof of these doctrines. Again, [they use] the saying from the Gospel, "I am in the Father and the Father in me, and we two are one."[11]

2,4 But they have taken all of their error, and the sense of their error, from certain apocryphal works, especially the so-called Egyptian Gospel, as some have named it.[12] (5) There are many such passages in it, purporting to be delivered privately in the person of the Savior as mysteries, as though he is telling his disciples that the Father is the same, the Son is same, and the Holy Spirit is the same.[13]

2,6 Then, when they encounter simple or innocent persons who do not understand the sacred scriptures clearly, they give them this first fright: "What are we to say, gentlemen? Have we one God or three gods?" (7) But when someone who is devout but does not fully understand the truth hears this, he is disturbed and assents to their error at once, and comes to deny the existence of the Son and the Holy Spirit.

3,1 Man's ancient adversary has inspired all these sectarians in order to deceive people—one in one way and one in another, but deceive most of them and deflect them from the way of the truth. (2) That God is truly one and there is no other, is plainly confessed in God's holy church, and it is agreed that we do not inculcate polytheism, but proclaim a single sovereignty. (3) However, we do not err in proclaiming this sovereignty but confess the Trinity—Unity in Trinity and Trinity in Unity, and one

---

[6] Cf. Athenagoras Leg. 10.
[7] Deut 6:4.
[8] Cf. Exod 20:3.
[9] Ps 80:10.
[10] Isa 44:6.
[11] Cf. John 10:38; 30.
[12] Hippolytus quotes a passage about souls from a "Gospel according to the Egyptians" at Haer. 5.7.8–9.
[13] Perhaps cf. NHC Gr. Seth 59,18, where Christ is made to say, "The Father, who is I."

Godhead of Father, Son and Holy Spirit. (4) For the Son did not beget himself, and the Father was not changed from his fatherhood < into being > a Son. Nor did the Holy Spirit ever call himself Christ; he called himself Spirit of Christ and given through Christ, proceeding from the Father and receiving of the Son.

(5) The Father is an entity, the Son is an entity, the Holy Spirit is an entity. But the Trinity is not an identity as Sabellius thought, nor has it been altered from its own eternity and glory, as Arius foolishly held. (6) The Trinity was always a Trinity, and the Trinity never receives an addition. It is one Godhead, one sovereignty and one glory, but is enumerated as a Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and not as one entity with three names; the names are truly complete and the entities are complete.

3,7 But nothing has been changed. The Father is always a father and there was no time when the Father was not a father. Because he is perfect, he is forever an actual Father. And the Son is forever perfect, forever actual, truly begotten of the Father without beginning, not in time, and ineffably. He is not brother to the Father. (8) He has had no beginning and will never come to an end, but co-exists with the Father forever as his true Son, begotten of the Father outside of time, the equal of the Father—God of God, light of light, very God of very God, begotten, not made. But he is not the Father himself, and the Father is not the Son himself; there is one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

4,1 For the Spirit is forever with the Father and the Son—not brother to the Father, not begotten, not created, not the Son's brother, not the Father's offspring. He proceeds from the Father and receives of the Son, and is not different from the Father and the Son, (2) but is of the same essence, of the same Godhead, of the Father and the Son, with the Father and the Son, forever an actual Holy Spirit—divine Spirit, Spirit of glory, Spirit of Christ, Spirit of the Father. For < scripture says >, "It is the Spirit of the Father that speaketh in you,"[14] and, "My Spirit is in the midst of you."[15] He is third in name but equal in Godhead, not different from the Father and the Son, bond of the Trinity, seal of the confession of it.

4,3 For the Son says, "I and the Father, < we two > are one."[16] He did not say, "*I am* one," but with "I" and "the Father" indicates that the Father

[14] Matt 10:20.
[15] Hag 2:5.
[16] Cf. John 10:30.

is an entity and the Son is an entity. And he said, "the two," not "the one"; and again, he said, "*We are* one," not, "*I am* one."

4,4 < He > likewise < says >, "Go baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."[17] But by inserting the conjunctions, that is, the syllable "and" [between the names], he refutes Sabellius, with his futile introduction of an identity. (5) For by < inserting > "and" he shows that there is truly a Father, truly a Son, and truly a Holy Spirit—but since the Trinity are of equal rank, and are called 'Trinity" as one name, he refutes Arius, with his notion of a subordination, difference or change in the Trinity.

4,6 For even though the Father is declared to be greater than the Son who glorifies him, the Father, with perfect propriety, preserves the < equal > glory for the Son. For who else but the true Son should glorify his < own > Father? (7) But when, again, he desires to state his equality [with the Father], to prevent certain persons from going wrong by thinking less of the Son he says, "Whoso honoreth not the Son as he honoreth the Father hath not life in himself,"[18] and, "All things that the Father hath are mine."[19] But what can "All things that the Father hath are mine" mean but, "The Father is God; I am God. The Father is life; I am life. The Father is eternal; I am eternal. All things that the Father hath are mine?"

5,1 See and understand, Sabellius! Open the eyes of your heart, and cease from your blindness! Let your mind, and the minds of your dupes, go with St. John to the Jordan. (2) Open your ears and hear the prophet's voice say, "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness."[20] Hear the Lord's fore-runner, privileged to be called "angel," who received the Holy Spirit in his mother's womb and leaped when Mary entered Elizabeth's dwelling. (3) While still in the womb he knew his Master's coming in and leaped for joy. To him was given the preparatory announcement of the Gospel, and the readying of the way of the Lord. Believe him, and you cannot miss the mark of the truth.

5,4 See here, John himself testifies by saying first, on recognizing his Lord, "I have need of thee, and comest thou to me?" And when the Savior said, "Suffer it to be so now, that all righteousness may be fulfilled,"[21] (5) and was himself baptized by John, "John bare record," as the divine

---

17 Matt 28:19.
18 Cf. John 5:23–24.
19 John 16:15.
20 John 1:23.
21 Matt 3:14.

Gospel says, and said, "The heavens were opened. And I saw the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove descending and coming upon him. And a voice from heaven, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."[22] (6) The Father was in heaven, you trouble-maker, the voice came from heaven! If the voice came from above, expound your false notion to me! To whom was the Father saying, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased?" And who was it?

5,7 And why did Spirit descend in the form of a dove, although he had no body? For the Only-begotten alone assumed a body, and was made perfect man of the ever-virgin Mary, by the Holy Spirit, (8) not by a man's seed. The Word, the Master Builder, formed his own body from Mary, took the human soul and mind and everything human, all in its perfection, and united it with his divinity. It was not as though he inhabited a man,[23] nothing like that! He himself is the holy Word, the divine Word incarnate.

6,1 But why does the Spirit appear in the form of a dove? Why but to convince you not to blaspheme, you would-be sage without a correct idea in your head, to keep you from thinking that the Spirit is identical with the Father or the Son? (2) Although the Spirit himself has never had a body, he is portrayed in the form of a dove to indicate and expose your error. For the Spirit is an entity in himself, and the Father is an entity, and the Only-begotten is an entity, but there is no division of the Godhead, or subordination of its glory. (3) And you see how the Trinity is enumerated, with the Father calling from on high, the Son baptized in the Jordan, and the Holy Spirit arriving next in the form of a dove.

6,4 Tell me, who was it that said, "Behold, my beloved Son shall understand, in whom I am well pleased, he whom my soul hath chosen. I shall put my Spirit upon him, and he will declare judgment to the gentiles. He will not strive nor cry, nor will his voice be heard in the streets. A bruised reed shall he not break and smoking flax shall he not quench until he bring forth judgment into victory,"[24] and so on? (5) Doesn't this convey the meaning of the Trinity, you trouble-maker? Or did the Father say all this in the prophet about himself?

---

[22] John 1:32; Matt 3:17.

[23] For the idea of inhabiting a man cf. NHC VII,2 Gr. Seth 51,21–24, "I visited a bodily dwelling. I cast out the one who was in it first, and I went in."

[24] Cf. Isa 42:1–4.

6,6 Who is it of whom scripture says, "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand?"[25] And it didn't say, "Enter into me." (7) Or again, why does the Gospel say, "And he ascended into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of the Father, and will come to judge the quick and the dead?[26] (8) Or again, why have the two men who appeared in white garments not convinced you by saying to the disciples, "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him taken up?"[27] (9) And at whom was the blessed Stephen looking when he said, "Behold, I see the heavens opened and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God?"[28] But you, you utter boor—you, on the other hand, have done harm to yourself and your followers by not understanding the voice of the holy scriptures and being deprived of the holy faith in God's truth.

7,1 Certainly he said, "I am the first and I am the last, and beside me there is no other."[29] (2) For of course there are not many gods! There is one God, the first and the last, Father, Son and Holy Spirit—and the Trinity is not an identification, and not separated from its own identity. It is a Father who has truly begotten a Son; and a Son truly begotten of the Father as an entity, without beginning and not in time; and a Holy Spirit truly of the Father and the Son, of the same divinity, proceeding from the Father and receiving of the Son, forever < an entity >, "one God, the first and the last."[30]

7,3 But this oracle in its turn is given to serve a different purpose, and in the person of Christ himself. Long ago in the time of the prophets our Lord Jesus Christ often appeared and foretold his incarnation—though some have not received him, but await someone else instead. (4) And it is meant for those who have a superstitious regard for idols and have brought polytheism to the world, to keep the children of Israel from being struck with fear and turned to [the worship of] the idols of the Amorites, Hittites, Canaanites, Perizzites, Hivites, Girgashites, Jebusites, Arucaeans, and Asanaeans, as they had been prophetically warned. (5) For they worshiped Baal Peor, Chemosh, Astarte, the Mazzuroth, the Neastho, Baal Zebub, and the rest of the idols of the heathen. And this is why the Lord

---

[25] Ps 109:1.
[26] Cf. Mark 16:19.
[27] Acts 1:11.
[28] Acts 7:56.
[29] Isa 44:6.
[30] Isa 41:4; 44:6.

told them, "I am the first and the last"—to turn them away from the error of the polytheist myth-makers.

7,6 And because they would spurn the advent of the Son himself, our Lord Jesus Christ, he told the Jews, "I am the first and the last"—the One who sojourned here first in the flesh, and will come at the last to judge the quick and the dead. He suffered on the cross, was buried and arose, and was taken up in glory in his body itself, but a body united in glory with his Godhead, and made radiant—no longer tangible, no longer mortal, for "Christ is risen,"[31] as the scripture says; "Death," says the apostle, "hath no more dominion over him."[32]

7,7 And see how [scripture's] accuracy guides a person, to keep him from error about either of the parts of the truth. Whenever his mind is inclined to construct a pantheon, he hears, "The Lord is thy God, the Lord is one." (8) But when the children of Israel await a Christ other than the Christ who has come, they hear, "I am the first and I am the last,"[33] and, "I am alpha and omega"[34]—the alpha which looks down, and the omega which looks up, in fulfillment of scripture's, "He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all rule and authority and dominion, and every name that is named."[35]

7,9 And < to show what the truth is* > when < someone > supposes < that > < only the Father is the true God* > because he has said, "I am the first and the last," "I am alpha and omega," "The Lord thy God is one Lord,"[36] and "I am he who is,"[37] so that no one will deny the Son and the Holy Spirit (10) he says, "My Father is greater than I,"[38] and, "that they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."[39] This is not [said] because the Son is not the true God, but to reduce the name of the Trinity to a single oneness, and redirect men's thinking from many divinities to one Godhead.

8,1 But if the blunderer Arius gets the notion that only the one, that is, only the Father, is called the "*true*" God, while the Son is God but not "*true* God," Christ refutes him in his turn, in another way. He says [of himself],

---

31 Luke 24:6.
32 Rom 6:9.
33 Isa 41:4; 44:6.
34 Rev 1:8.
35 Eph 4:10; 1:21.
36 Deut 6:4.
37 Exod 3:14.
38 John 14:28.
39 John 17:3.

"I am the *true* light, that lighteneth every man that cometh into the world,"[40] but of the Father, "God is *light.*"[41] (2) And he refrained from saying, "true light," so that we would realize the equality of the Father's Godhead with the Son's and the Son's with the Father's because of "*true* God" and "*true* light," and not be < misled* > because of the Father's being "light" and the Son's being "God" without the addition of "true" in those instances. (3) There was no need to say "true" [in these two latter cases], since there was no doubt about it. The one perfection of the same relationship—the Father's to the Son and the Son's to the Father—was made plainly evident from the words, "God" and "light."

8,4 And that demolishes all the idiocy of your error. The Father is a father, the Son is a son, and the Holy Spirit is a holy spirit. They are a Trinity—one Godhead, one glory, one sovereignty, < one God >, to whom be glory, honor and might, the Father in the Son, the Son with the Holy Spirit in the Father, forever and ever. Amen.

8,5 And we have now shaken this sect off, and trampled it in its turn by the power of the Holy Trinity, like a libys or molurus or elops, or one of those snakes which look very alarming but can do no harm with their bites. Let us once more go on to the rest, calling on him to come to the aid of my poverty and mediocrity, < so that > I may have his help in < giving* > a proper < account* > of each sect's teachings and activities, < and* > composing the refutations of them.

Against the first type of Origenists,[1] *who are shameful as well. 43, but 63 of the series*

1,1 There are people called Origenists, but this kind of Origenist is not to be found everywhere. I think, though, that the sect we are now discussing < arose > next after these [others]. (2) They are named Origenists, but I am not sure after whom. I do not know whether they < are derived > from the Origen who is called Adamantius the Author,[2] or from some other Origen. Still, I have learned of this name.

---

[40] John 8:12; 1:9.
[41] 1 John 1:5.
[1] Only Epiphanius mentions this group; his sources of information are plainly oral.
[2] συντάκτης.

1,3 The heresy they profess might have been modeled on the heresy of Epiphanes, whom I described earlier in the Gnostic Sects.[3] But these people read various scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. And they reject marriage, although their sexual activity is incessant. Some have said that the sect originated in the region of Rome and Africa.

1,4 They soil their bodies, minds and souls with unchastity. Some of them masquerade as monastics, and their woman companions as female monastics. And they are physically corrupted because they satisfy their appetite but, to put it politely, by the act of Onan the son of Judah. (5) For as Onan coupled with Tamar and satisfied his appetite but did not complete the act by planting his seed for the God-given [purpose of] procreation and did himself harm instead, thus, as < he > did the vile thing, so these people have used their supposed < female monastics >, committing this infamy.

1,6 For purity is not their concern, but a hypocritical purity in name. Their concern is limited to ensuring that the woman the seeming < ascetic* > has seduced does not get pregnant—either so as not to cause child-bearing, or to escape detection, since they want to be honored for their supposed celibacy. (7) In any case, this is what they do, but others endeavor to get this same filthy satisfaction not with women but by other means, and pollute themselves with their own hands. (8) They too imitate the son of Judah, soil the ground with their forbidden practices and drops of filthy fluid and rub their emissions into the earth with their feet, so that their seed will not be snatched by unclean spirits for the impregnation of demons.

2,1 But as I said, they use various scriptures of the Old and the New Testaments and certain apocrypha, especially the so-called Acts of Andrew and the others. Indeed, they themselves have often freely boasted of doing this thing. (2) Yet they accuse the members of the church, if you please. who have beloved "adoptive wives," as they call them, of doing this too—but secretly from respect for public opinion, so as to engage in the wickedness < in fact* >, but in pretense preen themselves on the name ["virgin"] from regard for the public.

2,3 But some have told me of certain persons, now dead, who supposedly also did this, having allegedly heard the information from women these people had forced into it. (4) Among them they used to mention a

[3] Pan. 32,3,1–5,1.

bishop who had exercised the episcopate for a number of years in a small town in Palestine and had had women of this sort, I mean adoptive wives, to wait on him. Indeed, I have learned even from confessors that he was that sort of person. (5) All the same, I do not believe the persons who have said this and claim to have heard it from the women. For the strong evidence of the speakers' malice led me sometimes to believe, but at other times to disbelieve their evil report of the aged bishop after his death. (6) For the charge against him was something like this: "So-and-so was caught in sin with a woman, and his defense when we confronted him was that his partner in pollution had told him about the vicious practice"—although she was already along in years and in her old age!—"and taught him to use her but scatter his dirty fluids outside, on the ground."

3,1 And this is their filthy act, which deceives their own minds and is blinded by the devil. (2) I see no need for me to cite the texts which have been their downfall.[4] Otherwise I might seem to be using the texts which I mean as criticisms, to discourage the evil practices of each sect, as an incentive to those whose minds are always unstable and vain, and who pursue evil for themselves rather than desiring good. (3) Rather than this I shall offer a few sample arguments as protection against this frightful, snake-like sect.

3,4 Where have you gotten the idea of your vile act, you people? For to begin with, who cannot see that your teaching is entirely the teaching of demons, and the mischief you have contrived is the behavior of deluded, corrupt persons? (5) If conception is in any way evil, this is not because of childbearing but because of carnal relations. Why, then, do you give in to lust and have carnal relations?

3,6 And if carnal relations are not evil, neither is it evil for the one who has them to consummate what he has done. Or < must > an ascetic not cultivate the fruits of the soil, as "Abel was a keeper of sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the ground?"[5] (7) But if one tills the ground, like Noah who "became an husbandman and planted a vineyard"[6]—Noah did not plant a vineyard in order for it not to yield vintage. He planted it and "drank of the fruit thereof and was drunken,"[7] as scripture says.

3,8 But the aged man is excus< able >; he was pleasing to God, and did not fall to drink from intemperance. Perhaps he was overcome with grief

[4] Contrast Pan. 26,8,4–9,2.
[5] Gen 4:2.
[6] Gen 9:20.
[7] Gen 9:21.

and fell into a stupor, and succumbed to weakness from infirmity and old age because he could not bear them; [in any case] it was not to be mocked by his son. (9) But the son who mocked him received his curse, for the punishment of those who offer insult to their parents, and of thoughts in us that rebel against the knowledge of God and the ordinance he has rightly decreed.

4,1 For even though marriage is not as highly honored as virginity and virginity is superior to it—for true virginity is called glorious and virtuous, not unclean—marriage is respectable too, < if one > employs[8] God's good creatures for procreation, not shame, and does not misuse God's appointed method of conjugal intercourse. (2) For in fact, virginity is the state the apostle commends because he says, "The virgin, and the unmarried woman, careth for the things of the Lord, how she may please the Lord, that she may be holy in body and soul"[9]—showing that even though the unmarried state is open to suspicion, it is no cause of faults.

4,3 Indeed, < propriety must be preserved in marriage* >. We know that Abraham sired children although he was dear to the Lord, and Isaac, Jacob and the rest. And they did not sully themselves with vile acts by touching filth and < slime* >, or oppose God's good ordinance of procreation through lawful wedlock. (4) Nor did those of them who practiced chastity and virginity debase the contest and make something else of it, as though to evade by trickery the virtuous mode of competing. (5) Elijah too never lightly entered towns or associated with women, but lived in deserts. Elisha, John, and all who < exhibited > this great mark of the imitation of the angels, made themselves eunuchs in the right way for the kingdom of heaven's sake, in accordance with the Lord's ordinance in the Gospel.

4,6 And although I have a great deal to say about them, and could expose the devil's mockery of their minds with many proofs from scripture, I rest content with these few. (7) For anyone can see that their behavior is not sensible, and that such knowledge is not from God; their ridiculous activity, and their fall into the practice of iniquity, are diabolically inspired.

4,8 And now that we have maimed this sect too—like the horrid snake we call the viper, which has a short body but breathes a breath which is fearful for its venom, and blows destruction at those who come near it—

[8] Holl: μεθοδεύει; MSS: ἀπαγορεύει.
[9] 1 Cor 7:34.

let us go on to the rest since we have crushed it, calling on God to help us keep the promise of our whole work in God.

Against Origen[1] *also called Adamantius. 44, but 64 of the series*

1,1 Origen, also surnamed Adamantius,[2] comes next after these. He was the son of the holy and blessed martyr[3] Leonidas,[4] and in his youth suffered a very great deal of persecution himself.[5] He was well schooled in the Greek education[6] and brought up in the church, and became known at Alexandria in the Emperor Decius' time. (2) He was a native Egyptian, but lived and was brought up in Alexandria, and perhaps also went to the schools at Athens[7] at some time.

1,3 It is said that he suffered a great deal for the holy word of the faith and the name of Christ, and indeed was often dragged around the city, insulted, and subjected to excruciating tortures.[8] (4) Once, as the story goes, the pagans shaved his head, set him on the steps of the temple of their idol which they call the Serapeum, and ordered him to hand out palm branches to those who went up the stairs for the vile act of worshiping the idol. (The priests of their idols take this posture.) (5) Taking the branches he cried out without fear or hesitation, with loud voice and a bold mind, "Come get Christ's branch, not the idol's!" And there are many accounts of his brave deeds which the ancients hand down to us.

2,1 But his deeds did not remain worthy of the prize till the end. He had been an object of extreme envy for his superior learning and education, and this further provoked the authorities of his day. (2) With diabolical malice the workers of iniquity thought of mistreating him sexually and making that his punishment, and they secured a black to abuse his body. (3) But Origen could not bear even the thought of this devil's work,

---

[1] Eus. H. E. 6,1–39 contains an admiring account of Origen's life. Epiphanius' less friendly treatment is not based on Eusebius, but probably upon oral tradition which may, however, be influenced by Eusebius. For Origen's life see also Jer. Vir. Ill. 54. 6,1–7,4 and 10,1–7 are quoted from Origen's Commentary on the First Psalm, and 12,1–62,15 from Methodius' *On the Resurrection.*

[2] Eus. H. E. 6.14.10.

[3] Eus. H. E. 6.1.1.

[4] Eus. H. E. 6.2.6; 12.

[5] Eus. H. E. 6.3.1–7.

[6] Eus. H. E. 6.2.7; 3.8; 19.10–14.

[7] Eus. H. E. 6.32.2; Jer. Vir. Ill. 54.

[8] Eus. H. E. 6.3.4–7; 4.1; 39.5.

and shouted that, given the choice of either, he would rather sacrifice.[9] (4) Certainly, as is widely reported, he did not do this willingly either. But since he had agreed do to it at all, he heaped incense on his hands and dumped it on the altar fire. (5) Thus he was excluded from a martyr's status at that time by the confessors and martyrs who were his judges, and expelled from the church.[10]

2,6 Since he had consented to this at Alexandria and could not bear the ridicule of those who reproached him, he left and elected to live in Palestine, that is, in Judaea. (7) On arriving at Jerusalem he was urged by the priesthood, as a man with such skill in exegesis and so highly educated, to speak in church.[11] (They say that the presbyterate had been conferred upon him earlier, before his sacrifice.)[12] (8) And so, as I said, since those who were then serving as priests in the holy church in Jerusalem urged him to speak in church and strongly insisted on it, he stood up and simply recited the verse of the forty-ninth Psalm, omitting all the intervening verses, "But unto the ungodly saith God, Why dost thou preach my laws and takest my covenant in thy mouth?"[13] And he rolled the scroll up, gave it back, and sat down in floods of tears, and all wept with him.

3,1 A while later, at the urgent request of many, he made the acquaintance of Ambrose, a prominent imperial official. (Some say that Ambrose was a Marcionite, but some, that he was a Sabellian.)[14] At any rate, Origen taught him to shun and abjure the sect and adopt the faith of God's holy church, for at that time Origen was of the orthodox, catholic faith. (2) Since Ambrose was from a different sect and, < being > an educated man, was a zealous reader of the sacred scriptures, he asked Origen to explain them to him because of the profundity of the ideas in the sacred books. (3) In compliance and at his urging, Origen was willing to become the interpreter of all the scriptures, as it were, and[15] made it his business to expound them. It is said that < he spent* > twenty-eight years in Tyre

---

[9] This appears to be a variation on the story of Origen's pupil Potimiaena, who is threatened with rape by gladiators, answers defiantly, and is put to death, Eus. H. E. 6.5.1–5.

[10] At Photius Bibl. 11 Eusebius is inaccurately reported as saying that a synod expelled Origen from Alexandria after this incident.

[11] Cf. Eus. H. E. 6.23.4.

[12] Eusebius places Origen's ordination to the presbyterate at Caesarea, H. E. 6.8.4–5; 23.4.

[13] Ps. 49:16. At In Psalmos 12.348 Origen says, "A sinner should not preside in the office of a teacher."

[14] Eusebius makes Ambrose a Valentinian, H. E. 6.18.1.

[15] Holl ἑρμηνεὺς γενέσθαι [καὶ] ἐξηγήσασθαι ἐπετήδευσε; Dummer retains the καί.

in Phoenicia[16] (4) < devoting himself* > to a life of extreme piety,[17] and to study and hard work. Ambrose provided support for him and his stenographers and assistants,[18] and papyrus and his other expenses;[19] and Origen carried his work on the scripture through by burning the midnight oil, and with the most intense study.

3,5 First, making a painstaking effort to collect the < books* > of the six [Old Testament] versions—Aquila, Symmachus, the Septuagint, Theodotion, (6) and a fifth and a sixth [version]—< he issued them* > setting each Hebrew expression next to them, and the actual < Hebrew > letters as well. But directly opposite these, in a second column next to the Hebrew, he made still another parallel text, but in Greek letters. (7) Thus this is, and is called a Hexapla,[20] and besides the Greek translations < there are > two parallel texts, of the Hebrew actually in < Hebrew > letters, and of the Hebrew in Greek letters. It is thus the whole Old Testament in the version called the Hexapla, and in the two Hebrew texts.

3,8 Origen had laboriously accomplished this entire work but he did not preserve his fame untarnished till the end, for his wealth of learning proved to be his great downfall. (9) Precisely because of his goal of leaving none of the sacred scriptures uninterpreted he, as an allurement to sin, disguised himself and issued mortally dangerous exegeses. (10) The so-called Origenists < took their cue* > from this. Not the first kind, the < ones who practice* > the obscenity. As I have already remarked, I cannot say whether they originate with this Origen who is also called Adamantius, or whether they have another founder whose name was < also > Origen.

3,11 It is said, however, that our Origen too contrived < a > measure affecting his body. < For > some say that he severed a nerve so that he would not be disturbed by sexual pleasure or inflamed and aroused by carnal impulses.[21] (12) Others say no, but that he invented a drug to apply to his genitals and dry them up. But others venture to ascribe other inventions to him—that he discovered a medicinal plant to assist memory.

---

[16] Jerome says that Origen died at Tyre, Vir, Ill. 54. Epiphanius locates Origen's literary activity there, and seems not to know of his headship of the catechetical school at Alexandria, which Eusebius emphasizes at H. E. 6.1–3.

[17] Origen's austerities are mentioned at Eus. H. E. 6.3.9–12.

[18] Holl ὄξυγράφοῖς [καὶ] τοῖς ὑπηρετοῦσιν αὐτῳ; Dummer retains the καί.

[19] Eus. H. E. 6.23.1–2.

[20] Cf. Eus. H. E. 6.16.1–4; Jer. In Tit. 3.9 (PL 26, 595B).

[21] Eusebius (H. E. 6.8.1–3) says that Origen did something serious to his body, but does not specify what.

(13) And though I have no faith in the exaggerated stories about him, I have not neglected to report what is being said.

4,1 The sect which sprang from him was located in Egypt first, but < it is > now < to be found > among the very persons who are the most eminent and appear to have adopted the monastic life, among those who have really retired to the deserts and elected voluntary poverty. But this is a dreadful sect and worse than all the ancient ones, and indeed, holds beliefs similar to theirs. (2) For though it does not train its disciples to perform the obscenity, it casts an evil suspicion,[22] one worse than the obscenity, upon the Godhead itself. For Arius took his cue from Origen, and so did the Anomoeans who succeeded him, and the rest.

4,3 For Origen claims, and at once[23] dares, if you please, to say first that the Only-begotten Son cannot see the Father, and neither can the Spirit behold the Son;[24] and angels surely cannot behold the Spirit, nor men the angels. (4) And this is his first downfall. For he does not believe that the Son is of the Father's essence, but represents him as entirely different from the Father, and created besides. But he holds that he is called "Son" by grace.

4,5 But he has other downfalls too, which are more serious. He says that the human soul is preexistent, and that souls are angels and celestial powers, but have sinned and so been shut up in this body as a punishment. (6) They are sent < down > by God as a punishment, to undergo a first judgment here. And so the body is called a "frame" (δέμα), says Origen, because the soul has been "bound" (δέδεσθαι) in the body, imagining the ancient Greek fabrication. And he spins other yarns about this as well. He says that we speak of a "soul" (ψυχή) because it has "cooled off" (ψυχθῆναι) in coming down.[25]

4,7 He smears on texts from the sacred scriptures that suit him, though not as they are or with their real interpretation. He claims that the words of the prophet, "Before I was humbled, I offended,"[26] are the words of the soul itself, because it "offended" in heaven before it was "humbled"

---

[22] Holl κακήν, MSS δεινήν.

[23] Marcianus, Urbinas, the Georgian, Delahaye: κατ᾽ ἀρχήν; Venetianus, Holl: περὶ ἀρχῶν.

[24] Orig. Princ. 1.1.8; Cf. Justinian, Ep. Ad Mennam, Mansi IX 489C.

[25] Orig. Princ. 2.8.3. Cf. Paschal Epistle of Dionysius of Alexandria for 401 A.D.=Jer. Ep. 96.15.1; for 402=Jer. Ep. 98.1.10; for 404=Jer. Ep. 100.12.1–3.

[26] Ps 118:6–7. Cf. the attribution of the penitential and supplicatory Psalms to the fallen Pistis Sophia, PS 52–56 et al.

in the body. (8) And "Return unto thy rest, O my soul,"[27] are the words of one who has been valiant in good works here, returning to his rest on high because of the righteousness of his behavior.

4,9 And there is much else of the sort to be said. He says that Adam lost the image of God. And this is why the skin tunics are signalized in scripture, for "He made them tunics of skin and clothed them"[28] refers to the body. And he talks a great deal of nonsense which is widely repeated.

4,10 He makes the resurrection of the dead a defective thing, sometimes nominally supporting it, sometimes denying it altogether, but at other times < saying > that there is a partial resurrection. (11) Finally, he gives an allegorical interpretation of whatever he can—Paradise, its waters, the waters above the heavens, the water under the earth. He never stops saying these ridiculous things and others like them. But I have already mentioned things of this sort about him, and discussed them at length, in some of my other works.[29]

5,1 But even now, in the Sect that deals with him, it will do no harm to describe them again for the same reason and purpose, and give his refutation from his own counterfeits. (2) For there is a great deal of his nonsense that came later, and the cultivation of an idea that is false and departs from the truth. (3) For he appeared to speak against every sect before him and refute each one, but later he spat this sect up into the world, one of no little influence.

5,4 So then, first I shall quote his own words in refutation of his false, bogus notion; then I shall show what I, in my mediocrity, intend to say against him. And here they are, the things he told the world in *The First Psalm*; (5) for though he is always on slippery ground in every scripture, in the essential parts he erred in so many words.

But since < his writings are* > very bulky—as I mentioned, he is said to have written a long work on every scripture—< it is impossible to quote all of it; but Origen never* > refused to say what he thought < in his expositions of the scripture* >. (6) And he has a modest reputation for what he said about ethics, types of animals and so on in his sermons and prefaces, and often gave clever expositions. (7) But in his position on doctrines, and about faith and higher speculation, he is the wickedest of all before and after him, except for the shameless behavior in the sects.

---

[27] Ps 114:7.

[28] Gen 3:21.

[29] Epiphanius means Anc. 54–64. See also the later Epiph/John of Jerusalem=Jer. Ep. 51.5.1; 7.

(8) (For as I indicated above, he chose to adopt even an ascetic style of life. Some say that his stomach was ruined by his excessively severe regimen, and fasting and abstention from meat.

5,9 Well then, I shall quote his own words from the *First Psalm*[30] < along with > his doctrinal speculations in it—word for word, so that no one may call my attack on him vexatious. (10) Not, by any means, that he strayed from the truth only in the *First Psalm*; as I have often said, he did it in every exposition. But because of the bulk of his work let me select some things from his *Psalm* here, and show the whole of his unsoundness in the faith from one, two or three remarks, of course taking care to speak against them. (11) And here, at once, is the text of every word, to show you, scholarly hearer, that Origen plainly held that the Son of God is a creature, and also show you, from his impudence about the Son, that he taught that the Holy Spirit is the creature of a creature. (12) Let us take a part of the *Psalm,* from the beginning until the actual expression [in question], in Origen's own words.

The beginning of Origen's commentary on the first Psalm

6,1 *God's oracles tell us that the sacred scriptures have been locked away and sealed with the "key of David"*[31]*—also, perhaps, with the seal of which it said, "an impression of a seal, hallowed to the Lord."*[32] *They are sealed, in other words, by the power of the God who gave them, the power which is meant by the seal.* (2) *In the Book of Revelation John instructs us further about this locking away and sealing and says, "And to the angel of the church in Philadelphia write, These things saith he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth, and none shall shut, and shutteth, and none shall open. I know thy works; behold, I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut it."*[33] (3) *And a little further on, "And I saw in the right hand of him that sat on the throne a book written within and on the backside, sealed with seven seals. And I saw another strong angel proclaiming with a loud voice, Who is worthy to open the book and to loose the seals thereof?* (4) *And no man in heaven, nor on earth, neither under the earth, was able to open the book, neither to look thereon. And I wept, because no man was found worthy to open the book, neither to look thereon.* (5) *And*

[30] Eusebius mentions this commentary at H. E. 6.25.1.
[31] Rev 3:7.
[32] Exod 28:36; Sir 45:12.
[33] Rev 3:7–8.

one of the elders saith unto me, Weep not. Behold, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, hath prevailed to open the book and the seven seals thereof."[34]

And, of the sealing alone, Isaiah says the following: "And all these words shall be unto you as the words of this book that is sealed. The which, if it be given to any man that is learned, saying Read this, he shall say, I cannot read it, for it is sealed, And this book shall be given into the hands of a man that is not learned, and one shall say unto him, Read this. And he shall say, I am not learned."[35]

6,7 *We must take it that this is said not only of John's Revelation and Isaiah, but of all of sacred scripture—admittedly, even by those who are capable of a fair understanding of the oracles of God. For scripture is filled with riddles, parables, difficult sayings and manifold other forms of obscurity, and is hard for human comprehension.* (8) *In his desire to teach us this the Savior too said, "Woe unto you lawyers!"—as though scribes and Pharisees held the key but made no effort to find the way to open the door. "For ye have taken away the key of knowledge. Ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye suffered not to enter."*[36]

7,1 *I have said this by way of preface, holy Ambrose, since I am compelled by your great love of learning and my respect for your kindness and humility, to embark on a struggle of the utmost difficulty, and admittedly beyond me and my strength.* (2) *And since I was hesitant for a long time, knowing the danger not only of speaking of holy things but, far more, of writing of them and leaving one's work for posterity, you will be my witness before God of the disposition with which I have done this—even though, with all the world, I too inquire into these matters. For with all sorts of friendly blandishment, and with godly encouragement, you have brought me to it.* (3) *And I sometimes hit the mark, but sometimes argue too vehemently or <otherwise*> appear to say something <too daring*>. I have, however, investigated the sacred writings without despising the aptly put, "When thou speakest of God, thou art judged of God," and, "It is no small risk to speak even the truth of God."*

7,4 *Now since without God there can be no good thing, most of all no understanding of the inspired scriptures, I ask you to approach the God and Father of all through our Savior and High Priest, the originated* (γενητός)

---

[34] Rev 5:1–5.
[35] Isa 29:11–12.
[36] Luke 11:52.

God, and pray that he will grant me, first, to seek rightly. For there is a promise of finding for those who seek; [*but*] *it may be that there is no promise at all for seekers if God deems them to be proceeding by a road that does not lead to finding.*

So far the excerpt from Origen

8,1 And first I need to discuss the term, "originated God," with this braggart with his illusory wisdom, this searcher out of the unsearchable and exhibitor of the heavenly realms, who, as a greater man than I has said, has filled the world with nonsense. (2) And anyone can see that there are many equivalents and synonyms. (3) If the term were used by someone else, one might say that this too had been said with right intent. But since I have found in many instances that Origen wrongly distinguishes between the Only-begotten God and the Father's Godhead and essence—and the same with the Holy Spirit—it is plain that by saying "originated God" he is pronouncing him a creature.

8,4 For though some would like to outwit me and say that "originated" is the same thing as "begotten," < this > is not admissible. < The latter may be said only of God, but the former* > may not be said of God, but only of creatures. "Originated" is one thing, "begotten," another.

8,5 Now as to Origen's statement that God is created or originated, let me ask first, "How was the person created whom, by this expression of yours, you honor as God? And if he is created, how can he be worshiped?" (6) Set aside the holy apostle's censure of those who make gods of created things; grant that a creature can be worshiped as God by the principles of the godly faith, which worships the creator, not the creature! Then it will be reasonable for you to derive your erroneous argument from the piety of the fathers. But you can certainly not prove this. (7) And even if you ventured to steal it from somewhere and distort it—even so, you Godstruck simpleton, you cannot change the good sense of the godly into judgment as poor as this! Both your intent and your argument are against you; (8) as I said, no created thing is worthy of worship. But if it is worthy of worship at all, then, since there are many other created things, it will make no difference to us if we worship them all along with the one creature; they are its fellow servants, and in the same category.

9,1 But let us see by the four Gospels through which the divine Word, when he came, revealed our whole salvation, whether Christ has ever said, "God created me," or, "My Father created me!" And let us see whether the Father declared in any of the Gospels, "I have created the Son and sent

him to you." (2) But enough of this for now; as to proof-texts, I have often cited them at length against people who introduce the notion of the Son's creaturehood.

9,3 Even here, however, it will do no harm to show the ease with which the term can be refuted and ask the would-be sage, "Mister, how can he be a creature when he says, "I am in the Father and the Father in me, and we two are one?"[37] (4) How can he be different from the Father when he has equal honor? For "No man knoweth the Son save the Father, nor the Father, save the Son,"[38] and, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father?"[39]

9,5 And in turn, resuming the thread I am likewise going to speak of all his doubts about resurrection, again from his own words. And let me make the whole of his opinion plain and reveal the infidelity of his doctrinal position from one passage. (6) < For > even though he has often spoken at length of this and talked nonsense about it in many books, I shall still offer the refutation from the argument he gives in *The First Psalm* against the sure hope of us who believe in the resurrection.

10,1 And it is as follows. He says, *Therefore the ungodly shall not arise in the judgment.*[40] Next (in his usual manner of parading the versions, *Likewise Theodotion, Aquila and Symmachus*. Then he scornfully attacks the sons of the truth:

10,2 *Thus the simpler believers suppose that the ungodly do not attain the resurrection and are not held worthy of the divine judgment; but they have no way of explaining what they suppose the resurrection is, and what sort of judgment they imagine.* (3) *For even if they think they are expressing their opinion of these matters, examination will show that they cannot defend the consequences of their beliefs, having no grasp of the nature of resurrection and judgment.*

10,4 *Thus if we ask them what it is a resurrection of, they reply, "Of the bodies we have now." If we then ask further whether or not there is a resurrection of our whole being before we examine them they say, "Of our whole being.'"* (5) *But if, allowing for the naivete of those who do not even < understand* > *the mutability of nature, we raise further questions and inquire whether all the blood that has been lost in bleedings will rise with our bodies—and all the flesh that has wasted away in illness, and all the*

[37] John 14:10; 10:30.
[38] Matt 11:27.
[39] John 14:9.
[40] Ps 1:5.

hair we have ever had, or only the hair we had at the last, towards our end— (6) *they are distressed and sometimes take offense at the questioning since they believe we must allow God to deal with these things as he wills. But sometimes, since they believe that our hair at the end of this life goes down to the grave with the body, they say that it will arise with it.* (7) *The better of them, however, to avoid having to take account of the blood which has flowed from our bodies on many occasions, and the flesh which changes < to > sweat or something else in illness, say that it is our body at the end that rises.*

11,1 These are the would-be sage's trifling objections to the truth; I have been obliged to quote them as proof for those who wish to know the full sense of his disbelief in the resurrection. Indeed, he makes many other < silly remarks* > in the course of the *Psalm,* one after another. (2) For he says, *Therefore the ungodly shall not arise in the judgment.*[41] From here on he attacks those who declare the certainty of the resurrection, and who believe in the sure hope of the resurrection of the dead, for their naivete. And by adducing many weak points, inculcating a sophistical opinion, (3) < and presenting > no reliable argument but any old thing drawn from logic for the ruin of his followers, he tried to overthrow the confession of our true hope in the resurrection by referring to the accidents of our nature.

11,4 But given my limited ability, I wouldn't dare hope to improve on those who have done good work already and replied with full justice to all the rhetorical villainy Origen has thought of. I believe I may rest content with the blessed Methodius' remarks against Origen with reference to the matter of the resurrection. I shall present these here, word for word; Methodius' words as he composed them are as follows:

An epitome of Origen's arguments, from the writings of Methodius

12,1 *Thus the simpler believers suppose that the ungodly do not attain the resurrection < and are not held worthy of the divine judgment; but they have no way of explaining > what they think resurrection is, < or what sort of judgment they imagine >.* (2) *For even if they think they are expressing their opinion of these matters, examination will show that they cannot defend the consequences of their beliefs < and have no grasp of the mode of the resurrection and judgment >.*

[41] Ps 1:5.

12,3 *Thus if we ask them what it is a resurrection of, they reply, "of the bodies we have now." If we then ask further whether or not there is a resurrection of our whole being before we examine them they say, "of our whole being."* (4) *But if, allowing for the naivete < of those who do not even understand the mutability of nature >, we raise further questions < and inquire > whether all the blood that has been lost in bleedings will rise with our bodies—and all the flesh and hair we have ever had, or just what we had toward our end—*(5) *they will be distressed and take refuge in the answer that God < may > do as he will. The better of them, however, will say that it is our body at the end that rises, and thus not have to take account of the same blood which flows from our bodies on many occasions, < and the flesh which changes to sweat or something else in illness >.*

12,6 *But because of the natural mutability of bodies and points of this sort, we have raised further questions. As foods are taken into the body and change their appearances,* (7) *so our bodies too are changed in birds of prey and wild beasts, and become parts of those bodies. And when they in turn are eaten by men or other animals, they are changed correspondingly and become the bodies of men and other animals.* (8) *And as this continues for a long time, the same body must often become a part of several men. In the resurrection, then, whose body will it be? And as a result we become immersed in senseless drivel.*

13,1 *And after these objections they resort to the reply that all things are possible with God, and cite texts from the scriptures which, if taken at their face value, are capable of supporting their opinion.* (2) *For example, Ezekiel's "And the hand of the Lord was upon me, and he brought me forth in the spirit and set me in the midst of the plain, and it was full of men's bones. And he brought me about them round about, and lo, there were very many upon the face of the plain, and lo, they were very dry.* (3) *And he said unto me, Son of man, can these bones live? And I said, Lord God, thou knowest these things.* (4) *And he said unto me, Prophesy, son of man. And thou shalt say unto them, Ye dry bones, hear the word of the Lord. Thus saith Adonai, the Lord, unto these bones: Lo, I will bring into you the breath of life, and I will put sinews upon you and cover you with flesh, and I will stretch skin upon you and put my Spirit within you, and ye shall live. And I will place you in your own land, and ye shall know that I am the Lord."*[42]

13,5 *They use this passage < as > something quite convincing. But they also < gather > sayings from the Gospels, such as, "There shall be wailing and*

[42] Ezek 37:11.

gnashing of teeth,"[43] *and, "Fear him that is able to destroy both soul and body in hell,"*[44] *and Paul's, "He shall raise up your mortal bodies through his Spirit that dwelleth in you."*[45]

14,1 *But every lover of truth, who is just as determined as they to contend for the resurrection, must both preserve the tradition of the ancients and guard against falling into the tomfoolery of contemptible notions which are both impossible and unworthy of God.* (2) *And at this point it must be stated that by nature no body ever has the same material substratum, since something such as food is put into it from without, and as this food is eliminated, further things such as vegetable and animal products are put in place of the further materials which have been put into it.* (3) *Thus the body has not inaptly been called a river. For strictly speaking, the first substratum in our bodies is scarcely the same for two days, even though, despite the fluidity of the nature of a body, Paul's body, say, or Peter's, is always the same.* (*Sameness does not apply only to the soul, the nature of which is neither in flux like our* [*body's*], *nor ever susceptible of addition.*) (4) *This is because the form which identifies the body is the same, just as the features which characterize Peter's or Paul's bodies remain the same—characteristics* < *like* > *childhood scars, and such peculiarities* < *as* > *moles, and any others besides.*

14,5 *This form, the bodily, which constitutes Peter and Paul, encloses the soul once more at the resurrection, changed for the better—but surely not this extension which underlay it at the first.* (6) *For as the form is* < *the same* > *from infancy until old age even though the features appear to undergo considerable change, so we must suppose that, though its change for the better will be very great, our present form will be the same in the world to come.*

14,7 *For a soul which is in bodily places must have bodies befitting the places.* (8) *And just as, if we had to become water creatures and lived in the sea, we would surely need gills and the other features of fish, so, as we are to inherit the kingdom of heaven and live in places superior to ours, we must have spiritual bodies.* (9) *But despite its change to greater glory the form of the previous body does not vanish, just as, at the transfiguration, the forms of Jesus, Moses and Elijah were not different from what they had been.*

15,1 *Therefore do not be offended if someone should say that the first substratum will not be the same then. For to those who can understand the matter, reason shows that, even now, the first substratum is not the same*

---

[43] Matt 8:12.
[44] Matt 10:28.
[45] Rom 8:11.

two days running. (2) *It also should be realized that one thing is sown, but a different thing comes up; for "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body."*[46] (3) *And Paul, practically teaching us that we will discard < every > earthly characteristic at the resurrection while our form will be preserved, adds, "This I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption."*[47] (4) *This will naturally be maintained in the case of the holy < body > by Him who gave form to the flesh—which is flesh no longer, but whatever was once characteristic of the flesh will be characteristic of the spiritual body.*

15,5 *And < as to> the sayings of the scriptures which our brethren cite, there is this to be said. First, Ezekiel's, since the simpler sort prefer to < rely > on it. According to these lines there will be no resurrection of flesh, but only of bones, skin and sinews.* (6) *At the same time they must be shown that they are too hasty, since they have not understood the passage. Simply because bones are mentioned we need not take them to mean the bones we have—just as it is obvious that, in "Our bones were scattered beside Hades,"*[48] *"All my bones were scattered,"*[49] *and, "Heal me, for my bones were troubled,"*[50] *it is plain that "bones" in the common acceptation of the word are not intended.*

15,7 *Now to this tally Ezekiel adds, "They say, Our bones are dried up. Are they therefore saying, "Our bones are dried up,"*[51] *with the intent that the bones be reassembled and rise? But this cannot be.* (8) *They could be saying, "Our bones are dried up," however, because they are in captivity and have lost all their living moisture. And so they add, "Our hope is perished, we are lost."*[52] *Thus the promise of the people's resurrection is a promise of their rising from their fall, and from the death which, in a way, they have died for their sins by being abandoned to their enemies.* (9) *Sinners too are called "sepulchers full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness"*[53] *by the Savior. And it is fitting that God open each of our graves of, and bring us forth from the graves quickened, as the Savior brought Lazarus forth.*

16,1 *But as to "There shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth,"*[54] *we must confront them with the objection that, as in this life the creator has made*

---

[46] 1 Cor 15:44.
[47] 1 Cor 15:50.
[48] Ps. 140:7.
[49] Ps 21:15.
[50] Ps 6:3.
[51] Ezek 37:11.
[52] Ezek 37:11.
[53] Matt 32:27.
[54] Matt 8:12.

every member of the body for some purpose, so he has made the teeth to chew solid food. Why do the damned need teeth, then? Our brethren do not claim that they eat in hell. (2) *And it must be pointed out that not everything in scripture is to be taken literally. Scripture says, "Thou hast broken the teeth of sinners,"*[55] *and, "The Lord hath crushed the teeth of the lions,"*[56] *but who is so foolish as to suppose that, while preserving sinners' bodies, God breaks only their teeth?* (3) *Just as whoever wanted the lines to read like that was obliged by his discomfort with them to resort to allegory, so one must look for the gnashing of the teeth of the damned. The soul has the faculty of "chewing* [*on things*]*," and when convicted of its sins will "gnash its teeth" by the clashing of its thoughts.*[57]

16,6 *But "Fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell"*[58] *perhaps teaches that the soul is incorporeal, or even, perhaps, means that the soul will not be punished apart from the body. I have already spoken from the naturalist's perspective of the form and the first substratum of the body.*

16,7 *And the apostle's saying, "He shall also quicken your mortal bodies,"*[59] *even when the body is mortal and incapable of true life, can be a proof that, although the bodily form of which we have spoken is by nature mortal, it will itself be changed from a "body of death,"*[60] *be quickened by the life-giving Spirit "when Christ who is our life shall appear,"*[61] *and from* <*fleshly*> *become spiritual.* (8) *And "Some man will say, How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come?"*[62] *is also plain proof that the first substratum will not be raised.* (9) *For if we have understood the illustration properly, we must hold that when the generative principle in the grain of wheat has laid hold of the matter which surrounds it, has permeated it entirely* <*and*> *has taken control of its form, it imparts its own powers to what was formerly earth, water, air and fire, and by prevailing over their characteristics transforms them into the thing of which it is the creator. And thus the ear of grain comes to maturity, vastly different from the original seed in size, shape and complexity.*

---

55 Ps 3:8.
56 Ps 57:7.
57 Holl: φρονημάτων; MSS: ὀδόντων.
58 Matt 10:28.
59 Rom 6:11.
60 Rom 7:24.
61 Col 3:4.
62 1 Cor 15:35.

Proclus' own words[63]

17,1 *So much by way of summary of the points which Origen endeavored to make in his treatise on resurrection, in proof of a very complex hypothesis. But consider too the points which follow from these.* (2) *It remains to take up the additional texts from scripture so that, like an image < with > all parts of it in proportion, this presentation may < thereby > gain < symmetry > and be fully framed as a whole, lacking nothing that contributes to its shape and beauty.* (3) *We must therefore explain why the scriptures which enable one to perfect a better proof agree with the above. For if one is capable of a precise understanding of this and falls short in nothing that is needed, he will realize that the resurrection may not be taken to apply to this body which cannot remain unchanged forever, but that it must apply to the spiritual body, in which the very same form that is even now preserved in this body will be retained—so that, as has also been said by Origen, each of us will be the same even in appearance.*

17,4 *For he proposed that the resurrection will be as follows: Since the material body is mutable, he says, and since it never remains even briefly the same but is increased and diminished in the form characteristic of the man, by which his appearance is preserved, we must of necessity expect the resurrection to be reserved for the form alone.* (5) *And lest you say, "I don't understand"—Origen's treatment of this was difficult—I shall explain the sense of this more clearly to you here.* (6) *You have surely seen an animal skin, or something else of the sort, filled with water in such a way that, if it is emptied of a little of its water and then filled with a little, it always shows the same shape; for the container's contents must conform to the shape of the container.* (7) *Well then, suppose the water is leaking out. If one adds an amount of water equal to that which is spilled and does not allow the skin to be entirely emptied of water, unless that occurs the added water must look like the water which was there before, since the container of the inflowing and the outflowing water is the same.*

17,8 *Now if one chooses to compare the body to this, he will not be put to shame. For what is brought in by the food in place of the flesh which has been eliminated will likewise be changed to the shape of the form which contains it. And the part of it that is dispersed to the eyes looks like the eyes, the part that is dispersed to the face looks like the face, and the part that is dispersed to the other members looks like them. Thus everyone looks the same, though*

[63] The Origenist speaker Proclus has been summarizing Origen's teaching on resurrection. Now he begins to speak for himself.

the flesh in them is not their original flesh, but the flesh of the form whose shape the incoming was given.

17,9 *Now if we are not the same in body even for a few days but are the same in the form of the body—only this is stable from its creation—all the more, neither will we be the same in the flesh then, but we shall be the same in the form which now < and > always is preserved and remains in us.* (10) *For as, although the body is not the same now, its appearance is kept the same because it has the same form, so, though the body will not be the same then either, the form will be manifest, grown more glorious—no longer in a perishable, but in an impassible and spiritual body as Jesus' was at the transfiguration when he ascended the mountain with Peter, and as were the bodies of Moses and Elijah who appeared to him.*

18,1 *So much for this; this, in sum, is the sense of Origen's doctrines.* (2) *But suppose that one who doubts this urges the body of Christ—for he is called "the firstborn from the dead"*[64] *and the "firstfruits of them that slept"*[65]*—and says that we must expect the resurrection of everyone's < bodies > to be like the resurrection of Christ, so that "God will bring them which sleep in Jesus with him"*[66] *in the same way that Christ was raised. But,* [*he will go on to say*]*, Jesus' < body > has risen even with the flesh it had, and with its bones, as Thomas was convinced. We* [*for our part*] *shall say,* (3) *"But Christ's body was not 'by the will of a man,'*[67] *'of pleasure accompanying sleep,'*[68] *'conceived in iniquities and begotten in sins.'*[69] *It was 'of the Holy Spirit, the power of the Highest and the Virgin,' "*[70] *while yours is the product of sleep, pleasure and dirt.* (4) *And thus the sage, Sirach, said, "When a man dieth it is said, He shall inherit creeping things, snakes and worms."*[71] *And < David > in the eighty-seventh Psalm said, "Wilt thou do wonders for the dead, or shall physicians rise up and confess thee? Will thy mercy be told in the grave and thy faithfulness in destruction? Will thy wondrous works be known in the dark, and thy righteousness in the forgotten land?"*[72] (5) *And for one who cares to gather them from the scriptures, there are other passages of the*

---

64 Col 1:18; Rev 1:5.
65 1 Cor 15:20.
66 1 Thes 4:14.
67 John 1:13.
68 Wisd Sol 7:2.
69 Ps 50:7.
70 Cf. Luke 1:35.
71 Sir 10:11.
72 Ps 87:11–13.

same kind. < Let us omit them >, lest, by mentioning them all, I make my discourse many times longer than what has been said.*

For the rest, the words of Methodius

19,1 *Proclus, then, came to a reluctant halt and the hearers were silent for some time, for they had been pretty well cast down into unbelief. And I saw that he had really finished, raised my head unnoticed by the rest, and heaved a sigh like sailors when the swell subsides, though I was still trembling slightly, and giddy—(I had been hit, I can tell you, and was overwhelmed by the frightfulness of the words.)* (2) *I turned to Auxentius and addressed him by name. "Auxentius," I said, "I believe that the line, 'Two proceeding together,'*[73] *was not spoken in vain, since we have two opponents. Therefore 'Let the both of us become as strong as the both of them.'*[74] (3) *I choose you for my ally and fellow combatant in the battle against them to keep Aglaophon, in alliance with Proclus and armed against us with Origen's objections, from sacking the resurrection.* (4) *Come then, let us stand our ground against their sophisms, fearing none of the counter-arguments by which the cowardly are struck. For there is no soundness or firmness whatever in them, but merely a specious show of words rehearsed for the purpose of aweing and swaying the hearers, not for the sake of the truth and for the hearers' benefit, but so that the words will sound wise to the audience.* (5) *Thus probable propositions, embellished for the sake of beauty and to give pleasure, are sometimes thought better by the masses than the results of precise investigation—though the teachers are not striving for improvement and still more, for holiness, but to please and succeed, like the sophists who take money for what they say, and cut the price of their wisdom for applause.*

19,6 *"Anciently, expositions were always brief, and were given by persons who were at pains, not to please, but to benefit the audiences of their day. But latterly, ever since, from carelessness, anyone has been permitted to interpret the scriptures, they have all been filled with conceit and lost their keenness for doing good, but have prided themselves on their progress in debating as though they were clever enough to know everything—ashamed to admit that they needed teaching but < ambitious* > to contend, like their teachers, and to seek to surpass . . .*[75] (7) *Thus from over-confidence they have lapsed from*

[73] Iliad 10.244.
[74] Iliad 21.308–9.
[75] Some material has fallen out at this point.

piety, meekness, and the belief that God can do all that he has promised, and have come to meaningless, blasphemous disputations, unaware that deeds were not performed for the sake of words, but words [*were spoken*] *for the sake of deeds—as* < *in* > *medicine, whereby the sick must be cured by the putting of set words into application—so that, once we have been tuned, our minds may be in full accord with our best words, and, like lyres, provide behavior in tune with our speech, but not discordant and inharmonious.* (8) *To attain to righteousness we must truly struggle to practice it—not struggle in appearance, setting foot on the path of wisdom with a limp, and in place of a real effort making an apparent one, disguised with pretexts, pretenses, and all the trappings of hypocrisy.*

20,1 *For there are indeed persons who, like women artfully made up for deception,* < *beguile the simple** > *with the embraces of words showily adorned, unless someone examines them with a concern for those even younger in the faith, and in a sober manner.* (2) *One must take care, then, before he learns to accept this sort of talk with trust. For deceivers often overtake the wavering, just as the Sirens overtake those who flee from them by disguising their hatred of humanity with beautiful singing from afar.* (3) *Or what do you* < *think* > *of this situation, Auxentius?" I said.*

"The same as you," he replied.

20,4 *"Mustn't we say, then, that the heretical sophists are no more than forgers of images of truth, who, like painters, know nothing of truth? For painters attempt to portray shipwrights, boats and pilots without knowing how to build or pilot ships.*

20,5 *"Now then, let's scrape their paint off,* < *if* > *you will, to convince those who, like children, admire such paintings that neither is this ship a ship, nor this pilot a pilot. It is a wall with its surface decorated for pleasure's sake with paint and pictures, and the artists who made these things with their paints are imitators, not of a ship but of the image of a ship and pilot."*

20,6 *"For one who is eager to hear you, your introduction is lengthy."*

"Lengthy, my friend, but useful. If one were to remove the words of inspired scripture which these people have daubed on their opinion with bright colors for their own deception, and have arrogantly called righteousness and truth when they know nothing about righteousness, how scornfully do you think they would be treated if they were stripped of such names?"

"Very," replied Auxentius.

20,7 *"Would you like to be the leader on this journey, Auxentius," I said, "or should I?"*

"By rights you should," he said, "since you're initiating the discussion."

21,1 *"All right, it was said—come on, let's examine Aglaophon's mind a bit, going in order from the beginning. It was said that because of its transgression the soul has assumed this body we wear, after living blissfully without it in former times.* (2) *For < he said > that the skin tunics are the bodies in which it has been the soul's lot to be shut up, to be punished for their deeds by carrying corpses. Or wasn't this what you said first, Doctor, at the beginning? Come, if you think I've forgotten something, remind me."*

20,3 *"There's no need to remind you of it; this was exactly what I said at the beginning."*

20,4 *"Oh? As you went on, didn't you also say repeatedly that, because of its preoccupation with adornment, comfort, and the other temptations that accompany the craving of the belly, the body is a hindrance to our understanding and knowledge of the true reality? And further, that it is the cause of blasphemies and all sorts of sins, since by itself, apart from a body, a soul cannot sin at all?* (5) *And therefore the soul must remain free and devoid of a body after its departure, so that it may be without sin and transgression in the heavens, where, too, it will hold converse with the angels. For this body is the soul's accessory and abettor in pollution and sin;* (6) *there is no way a soul can sin without a body. Hence, for its preservation without sin forever, the soul will never again receive the body, to incline it to corruption and unrighteousness here below."*

21,7 *"Yes, this was also said."*

"Oh?" I said. "And do you think you've said this well and rightly?"

"What difference does it make to you?" said Algaophon. "But you aren't refuting my argument."

21,8 *"No difference," said I, "but I want to see your argument tested by your own words."*

"I spoke well and rightly," he said.

"But if someone contradicts and disagrees with himself, do you think his case is put well and rightly?"

"Indeed not!"

21,9 *"Do you think he's clumsily pretending to the truth?"*

"The worst of anyone," he said.

"Then you don't approve of someone who plays the tune of his words with a false note?"

"I sure don't!"

21,10 *"Then you can't possibly approve of yourself, because you're speaking clumsily. You've allowed that souls have strayed from God's commandment and sinned without bodies, and have said that God gave them the skin*

tunics later because of their wrongdoing so that they would be punished by carrying corpses—interpreting 'tunics' to mean the bodies. But in the course of your argument you forget your original proposition and say that, by itself, the soul can't sin. (11) *Sinning is in no sense its nature; the body has become its accessory in evils of all sorts. Thus it will be without a body for all eternity, so that it may never again be incited to wickedness as it was before by the body.* (12) *And yet you had first said that the soul had sinned in Paradise before it had a body, when it was still blessed and free from pain. For once its sin had been strengthened because of its obedience to the serpent, the soul was given the body as a prison in punishment for its transgression of the commandment.*

21,13 *"Thus either your former or your latter statement is incorrect. Either the soul sinned before it had a body and won't be any more of a sinner even if it doesn't get one, and your blather about the body's not rising is worthless. Or else it sinned with a body, and the skin tunics can't be considered to be bodies.* (14) *For the man clearly broke the divine commandment before the tunics were made; indeed, the tunics were made to cover the nakedness which had resulted from their sin.* (15) *But do I convince you, and do you see that you've offered contrary propositions'? Has this been made clear to you, Aglaophon," I asked, "or don't you understand what I mean yet?"*

21,16 *"I understand," he said, and don't need to hear anything twice; I failed to notice that I spoke incorrectly. If I allowed that the skin tunics are bodies, I was obliged to admit that the soul had sinned even before it entered a body,* (17) *for the transgression came before the making of the tunics. For the tunics are made for them because of the transgression, the transgression isn't committed because of the tunics. And because of this admission I had to agree that this body is not an accessory to evil, but that the soul in itself is responsible.*

21,18 *"Thus the soul will sin even if it doesn't get the body, since even before it did, it sinned without a body. And it is foolish to say that the body cannot come back to life for fear of its becoming the soul's accessory in sin.* (19) *For just as the soul sinned even before it had a body, so it will sin after discarding the body, even if it doesn't receive a body again. On these grounds, then, I must not approve of my or anyone else's saying that the skin tunics are our bodies. For if I did, I would have to admit the truth of your argument."*

22,1 *"But Aglaophon," I said, "don't you think you've made another error?"*

"What error?"

"You said," I replied, "that the body has been contrived as a prison and bond for the soul, and this is why the prophet called us 'prisoners of earth,'[76] *and David called us 'bound.'"*[77]

22,2 *"I can't answer you offhand," said Aglaophon. "But why not discuss it with someone else?"*

22,3 *And I—I saw that he was embarrassed, and afraid of losing the argument. "Do you think I'm trying to refute you from envy," I said, "and am not eager to clear the matter up? Don't flag under questioning, friend.* (4) *You see that we aren't talking about unimportant matters, but about the way in which we are to believe. I doubt that anything does a man as much harm as the essentials of the faith, if he should have a false idea of them.*

22,5[78] *"Come on, face my questions willingly! Explain yourself, and correct me if you feel I am speaking an untruth, thinking more of the truth than of me. For I believe that to be refuted is better than to refute, to the same degree that to be saved from harm oneself is better than to save someone else from harm.* (6) *Well then, let's compare our statements and see if there is any difference between them. The things we are arguing about are no small matters, but things which it is better to know about, and a disgrace not to. Well then, you don't believe that the body returns to life, but I do."*

"Precisely," he said, "and this is the reason I have spoken."

22,7 *"And," I went on, "you said that the body is a prison, dungeon, tomb, burden and chain, while I disagree."*

"You're right," he said.

22,8 *"In fact, you've said that the body is an accessory to licentiousness, error, pain, anger, and in a word, all the other evils that hinder the soul's improvement and do not allow us to attain the understanding and knowledge of true reality.* (9) *For even if we attempt a search for some part of reality, darkness always falls and obscures our reason, and does not permit us a clear view of the truth. For perception by our ears is full of deceit, as you said, and perception by our sight and by our other senses."*

22,10 *"Eubulius," he said, "do you see that I'm ready to compliment you whenever you explain my words correctly?"*

23,1 *"All right, to get you to compliment me some more—if you people think that the body is a prison, it cannot still be blamed for the soul's wicked-*

---

[76] Lam 3:34.

[77] Ps 145:7.

[78] From this point until the end of the chapter we renumber the paragraphs, to correct an apparent typographical error in Holl.

ness and unrighteousness, but on the contrary, must be considered the cause of its moderation and discipline. (2) *Look here, you can follow me better in this way. Where do we take people with bodily ailments? To the doctors, don't we?"*

"Obviously," said Aglaophon.

23,3 *"And where do we take criminals? Isn't it to the magistrates?"*

"Of course!"

"Is this so that they will be punished justly for what they have done?" I said.

"Yes."

"But justice is the finest thing there is?"

He agreed.

"But is one who gives a just judgment right—for he is judging justly?"

He assented.

"But is the right thing beneficial?"

"Plainly."

23,4 *"Then those who are judged are benefited. Their wickedness is removed because it is prevented by their torments, just as illnesses are removed by surgery and pharmacy at the doctor's. For the punishment of the criminal is the correction of the soul, which throws off the severe disease of wickedness."*

He agreed.

23,5 *"Oh? Wouldn't you say that the punishments which are proportionate to their crimes are imposed with justice on criminals, just as surgery proportionate to their hurts is applied to patients?"*

He nodded.

23,6 *"Then one whose crimes deserve death is punished with death, one whose crimes deserve the lash is punished with the lash, and one whose crimes merit imprisonment is punished with prison?"*

Aglaophon agreed.

23,7 *"And the offender incurs the penalty of prison, blows, or some other punishment of the sort, so that he will reform and abandon his wickedness, like bent wood straightened by hard blows?"*

"You're quite right," he said.

23,8 *"The judge isn't punishing him for his past crime but for the future, so that he won't do it again?"*

"Plainly," he said.

23,9 *"For it is plain that prison eliminates his criminal tendencies by not permitting him to do as he pleases?"*

"True."

23,10 *"Then he is prevented from misbehaving, since his imprisonment does not leave him free to enjoy his pleasures. It confines him and teaches him respect for what is right, until such time as he is chastened and learns good sense."*

"That is plain," said Aglaophon.

23,11 *"In that case imprisonment is not accessory to wrongdoing."*

"Evidently not."

"Instead, it teaches good sense and makes men better. It is the prophylactic of the soul, harsh and bitter but medicinal."

"Plainly so," he said.

23,12 *"Well then? Come, let's examine the consequences once more. Didn't you grant that the body is the prison of the soul because of its transgression?"*

"I did and I do," he said.

23,13 *"But that the soul sins with the body—if you think that adultery, murder and impiety, which the soul commits with the body, are sin?"*

He nodded.

23,14 *"But we have agreed that a prisoner cannot commit crimes?"*

"We have," he said.

"He is prevented from committing them because he is loaded with chains?"

"Yes."

"And the flesh is the soul's prison?"

He nodded.

23,15 *"And yet we sin while we are in the flesh, with the consent of the flesh?"*

"We do," he said.

23,16 *"But a prisoner in bonds can't sin?" Here, too, he nodded.*

"For he is restrained?"

"Yes."

"His bonds don't permit him to sin?"

"Obviously not."

23,17 *"But the body is an aid to sin?"*

"Yes."

"While the prison prevents it?" He agreed.

23,18 *"Then, Aglaophon," I said, "the body is not a prison on your premises or anyone else's. It is the soul's aid either way, for good or evil."*

He agreed.

24,1 *"Then, Aglaophon, if this is the case, defend your first proposition. You said previously that the body is the prison, dungeon and bond of the soul. And do you see that what you said does not agree with what we are saying now?* (2) *How could it, my friend, if, on the one hand, we must suppose that the flesh is a prison, but on the other, that the soul has it as its partner in crime and its fellow prisoner? This isn't possible.* (3) *If the body was given to the soul as a place of torment because of sin, so that the soul in pain may be taught to honor God, how can the body be the soul's accomplice and partner in crime? Imprisonment, confinement, chains, and, in a word, all such corrective punitive devices are inhibitors of crime and sin for the prisoners.* (4) *Prison is not prescribed for the wrongdoer as an aid in wrongdoing, so that he will do further wrong, but so that, tortured by his chains, he will stop. It is for this reason that judges put malefactors in chains.* (5) *Even against their will they are kept from evildoing by their shackles; evil is an option, not for prisoners but for free men who live unguarded.*

24,6 *"Man first committed murder like Cain, progressed to unbelief, gave heed to idols, abandoned God. And why was the body given to him for a prison? Or, after man had transgressed before he had a body, why would God give him the body as an aid to greater wickedness?* (7) *Why does God say, 'Lo, I have set before thee life and death; choose life! I have set before thee good and evil; choose good!'*[79] *after the making of the prison, and 'If ye be willing and hearken unto me?'*[80] *These things were said to a person free to choose, not a prisoner under restraint.*

24,8 *"On all grounds, then, it is established that < we must > not regard the body as a chain, imprisonment or incarceration, or souls as therefore 'prisoners of earth,*[81] *with God condemning them to be bound in chains of clay.* (9) *How can this be, when there is no proof of it? But it is also plainly absurd to suppose that the body will not accompany the soul in eternal life because it is a prison and a bond, to prevent our becoming prisoners forever, as they say, sentenced to corruption in the kingdom of light.* (10) *For once the assertion in which they declared the flesh to be the 'prison of the soul' has been refuted and discredited, the statement, 'The flesh will not rise lest we become prisoners in the kingdom of light'—and may this kingdom be ours!—is discredited as well.*

---

[79] Deut 30:15.
[80] Isa 1:19.
[81] Cf. Lam 3:34.

25,1 *"Well, what other truth must I show to convince the captious, clearer than what has been said so that they will find it acceptable? One could refute this contention of theirs both by these arguments and by many more.* (2) *I shall prove in what follows, in the course of the discussion, with real truths and not with conjectures, that Jeremiah did not call us 'prisoners of earth' because of our partnership with the body, nor did David called us 'bound' for this reason.* (3) *As to the skin tunics and the fact that our first parents had bodies before the tunics were made and still enjoyed immortality, and further, that the body cannot be regarded as a prison and dungeon, I have made the appropriate remarks, gentlemen of the jury.* (*For I summon you to be the judges of my argument, 'most excellent Theophilus.'*)[82] *As I promised I turn now to the sequel, to give us a clearer view of the things we would like to see."*

26,1 *God, the creator of all, brought all into being in good order like a great city, and regulated it by his decree. Each element had been joined in harmony by his will, and all had been filled with various living things, so that the world would grow to perfect beauty. He therefore gave life to all sorts of forms—stars in the sky, birds in the air, beasts on earth and fish in the water—and finally, after preparing the universe as a wonderfully beautiful home for him, God brought man into the world* (2) *as a likeness answering to his own image. He made him with his own hands like a glorious image in a noble temple.*

26,3 *For it is understood that whatever God fashioned with his own hand must be immortal, being the work of immortality.* (4) *Immortal things are made immortal by immortality, as evil things are made evil by evil, and unrighteous things unrighteous by unrighteousness. For unrighteous deeds are not the work of righteousness, but of unrighteousness. Nor, on the contrary, is righteous behavior the work of unrighteousness but of righteousness—just as corrupting is not the work of incorruption either but of corruption, and immortality not the work of corruption but of incorruption.*

26,5 *And in a word, whatever the maker is like, the product must necessarily be made like, on the same principle.* (6) *But God is immortality, life and incorruption, and man is the work of God. Anything made by immortality is immortal; man is therefore immortal. This is why God created man in person, but ordered earth, air and water to bring forth the other kinds of living things.*

---

[82] Luke 1:3.

26,7 *Man has been truly said to be neither a soul without a body by nature, nor a body without a soul, but that which, by the union of soul and body, has been compounded into the one form, that of the good. Hence it is plain that man was made immortal, free of decay and diseases.*

26,8 *One may also learn this well enough from the scripture. Of the other creatures which are changed at intervals of time by being young and growing old, it is said, "Let the waters bring forth creeping things"*[83] *and "Let the earth bring forth living souls according to their kind, four-footed creatures and creeping things and beasts of the earth according to their kind."*[84] (9) *But "Let the earth bring forth" is no longer said of man as it was of them, nor "Let the waters bring forth," nor "Let there be lights."*[85] *Instead* [*we read*] *"Let us make man in our image and after our likeness, and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the sky, and over all cattle,"*[86] *and "God took dust from the earth and formed man."*[87]

27,1 *Now then, so that you too may further understand the difference* < *in* > *whole and in part between man and the other creatures, and how man ranks next to the angels in honor because of his immortality, let us take this question up in turn in accordance with the true and orthodox reasoning.* (2) *Animation and life were given to the others by their inhalation of the wind in the air, but to man by the immortal and all-excelling essence itself, for "God breathed into his countenance the breath of life, and man became a living soul.*[88] (3) *The others were commanded to serve and be ruled, but man to rule and be the master. The others are given various natural shapes and forms, as many as their tangible, visible nature engendered at God's bidding.* (4) *Man, however, is given God's image and likeness, and entirely conformed to the original image of the Father and the Only-begotten. "For God created man; in the image of God created he him."*[89]

27,5 *Thus, as sculptors are concerned for their images, God was concerned for the preservation of his own image, lest it be easily destroyed.* (6) *Sculptors not only think of* < *the* > *beauty and loveliness of their pieces, to make them wonderfully beautiful, but also plan for their immortality as far as they can, so that they will be preserved for a long while without being broken. So*

---

[83] Gen 1:20.
[84] Gen 1:24.
[85] Gen 1:14.
[86] Gen 1:26.
[87] Gen 2:7.
[88] Gen 2:7.
[89] Gen 1:26.

with Phidias. (7) *After he had finished the Pisaean image—it was made of ivory—he had oil poured in front of the image around its feet, to keep it as nearly immortal as possible.* (8) *Now if this is so with the makers of human handiwork, did not the supreme craftsman, God, who can do all things and even create from nothing, of every necessity see to it that man, his own rational image, was wholly indestructible and immortal? Did he allow what he had seen fit to make in a distinctive way, and had fashioned with his own hands, in his image and after his likeness, to be most shamefully destroyed and consigned to ruin and corruption—the ornament of the world, for the sake of which the world was made? This cannot be said! Away with anyone so foolish as to think it!*

28,1 *But probably, Aglaophon, you people will not back off because of what has now been said, and will reply, "If the creature was immortal from the beginning, as you say, how has he become mortal? An immortal thing must remain unalterably what it is, without changing or degenerating into something inferior and mortal. This cannot be, since < it is not possible* > for an immortal < thing to come to die."* >*

28,2 [*But it did*], *I shall say, because the enemy of all good came, and from envy bewitched the man who had been created with the authority to choose the good, and had received this ordinance.* (3) *"For God created man for immortality and made him an image of his own eternity.*[90] *Indeed, "God made not death, nor doth he rejoice in the destruction of the living"*[91] *"but through envy of the devil death entered the world,"*[92] *as Wisdom testified through Solomon.*

28,4 *"Where did death come from, then?" If God did not make death, this has to be asked again. "If it came from envy, why was envy stronger than God's purpose?" But this last is blasphemy, we shall say.*

28,5 *"Where did envy come from, then?" our antagonist will say. "If from the devil, why was the devil made? If he was made, is his maker then responsible for the existence of evil?* (6) *But God is in no way responsible for anyone's evil. Thus the devil must be uncreated—and if uncreated, also impassible, indestructible and in need of nothing."*

An uncreated thing must necessarily possess all these attributes, and yet the devil is brought to nothing and chastised. Now whatever is chastised

---

[90] Wisd Sol 2:23.
[91] Wisd Sol 1:13.
[92] Wisd Sol 2:24.

undergoes change and suffers, while an uncreated thing cannot suffer. The devil, therefore, is not uncreated but created.

28,7 *But if the devil is created, and every created thing originates from some beginning and has a creator, the devil has a creator. And is the creator uncreated or created? But it must be understood that there is only one uncreated, God. Nor can there in any conceivable way be any creator whatever other than he. "I am the first and I am the last," he says, "and besides me there is no God."*[93]

28,8 *Nor can anything be changed or created contrary to God's will. Even the Son acknowledges that "He can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do. What things soever the Father doeth," he says, "the Son doeth likewise."*[94] (9) *Surely God can have no antagonist, opponent or rival god. If anything were to oppose God it would cease to exist, for its being would be destroyed by God's power and might. For only the Maker can destroy—even the things that are immortal.*

29,1 *"Then what is the devil?" you will say. A spirit assigned to matter, as Athenagoras has also said.*[95] *He was created by God like the other angels, and entrusted with the oversight of matter and material forms.* (2) *For this was the origin of the angels—their creation by God for the care of his created order. Thus God would have the general and universal care of the universe, having attached the supreme authority and power over all to himself and guiding the whole on a straight course, like a ship, with the rudder of his wisdom; but angels who have been assigned to it would have the care of the various parts.*

29,3 *The other angels kept to the tasks for which God had made and appointed them, but the devil mocked at his and became evil in the management of the things which had been entrusted to him. He conceived envy of us, like the angels who later became enamored of flesh and consorted with the daughters of men for pleasure.* (4) *For as in man's case, so to the angels God has allotted a will free to choose good or evil, either to obey his command, be with him and enjoy beatitude, or else to disobey and be judged.*

29,5 *The devil too was a "morning star"—"How hath the morning star fallen from heaven, that riseth in the morning!"*[96] *He once rose with the angels of light, once was a morning star, but he fell, was dashed to the earth, and is* [*now*] *the governor of the forces hostile to man. For the Godhead is*

---

[93] Isa 44:6.
[94] John 5:19.
[95] Athenagoras Legatio 24.2.
[96] Isa 14:12.

angry with the proud and balks their arrogant purposes. (6) *But it occurs to me to say in verse,*

Thou serpent, source and end of ills for all,
Thou bearer of a grievous store of woes,
Thou false guide of a blind world's ignorance,
That joyest in the wails and groans of men!
'Twas thou that armed the fratricidal arms
Of kin to deeds of lawless violence.
By thy contriving Cain first fouled the soil
With secret bloodshed, and the first-formed man
Fell to the earth from realms unblemished.

30,1 *That is what the devil is. But death was devised for the sake of conversion, just as blows were devised for the correction of children beginning to read. For death is nothing but the severance and separation of soul from body.*

30,2 *"What, then," you will say, "is God the cause of death?" Again the same answer comes to me, "No indeed! Neither are teachers primarily responsible for children's being hurt by the blows.* (3) *Death is a good thing, then, if, like blows for children, it was devised for conversion. A word to the wise—*[*I do not mean*] *the death of sin, but the death of the sundering and separation of the flesh* [*from the soul*]*."*

30,4 *The man was responsible for himself and his own master, and as I said, had received a free will and the liberty to choose the good. And he had been told, "From every tree in the garden ye may eat, but from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil ye may not eat thereof. For in the day wherein ye eat of it, ye shall surely die."*[97] (5) *But once he had given in with regard to eating of it to the devil, who was inciting his entrapped wisdom to all sorts of disobedience, he set God's command aside. And this became a stumbling block, snare and hindrance for him.*

25,6 *For God did not make evil, and is absolutely not responsible, in any way at all, for any evil. But when any creature which God has created free to observe and keep the law he has justly enjoined, fails to keep that law, that creature is called evil. And to disobey God, by overstepping the bounds of righteousness of one's own free will, is the most serious harm.*

25,7 *Thus, because the man was spotted and sullied by his rejection of God's decree, and was smeared with the stains of the great evils the prince of darkness and father of deceit had brought forth—and because, as the*

[97] Gen 2:16–17.

scripture says, he was sentenced to hard labor so that the devil could keep deceiving him and inciting him to unrighteousness—God the almighty, seeing that, as the devil was a deceiver, man had been made an immortal evil by the devil's plot, (8) *made the skin tunics, as though to clothe the man with mortality, so that all the evil which had been engendered in him would die with the destruction of his body.*

31,1 *These questions have already been raised, and it has been shown that the skin tunics were not Adam's and Eve's bodies. Still, let us explain it once more—it is not a thing to be said only once.* (2) *The first man himself acknowledged that he had bones and flesh before the tunics were made, when he saw the woman brought to him and cried, "This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh. She shall be called, Wife, for she was taken out of her husband. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and cleave unto his wife, and the two shall be one flesh."*[98]

31,3 *For I have no intention of putting up with certain chatterboxes who do violence to the scripture without a blush, suggest that they were "intelligible bones" and "intelligible flesh," and turn things topsy-turvy with allegories in one passage after another, as their excuse for saying that the resurrection is not a resurrection of flesh.* (4) *This though Christ confirms the fact that the scripture should be taken as written, when he answers the Pharisees' question about the divorce of a wife with "Have ye not read that in the beginning the creator made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother,"*[99] *and so forth? How can "Be fruitful and fill the earth?"*[100] *be taken merely of souls? Or* (5) *"God took dust from the earth and formed the man"*[101] *which is plainly said of the body proper? The soul was not made of earth and the heavier materials.* (6) *Thus it is established with full certainty that the man was provided with a body before the skin tunics were made. For all these things are said before his fall, but the making of the tunics is described after the fall.*

31,7 *Let us thus return to the investigation of the matter in hand, since we have given sufficient proof that the skin tunics were not* [*Adam's and Eve's*] *bodies, but the mortality which was made for beasts because of the beasts' want of reason—for only this explanation remains.* (8) *Rest assured, the man was exiled from Paradise for the following reason. God did not expel him because he did not want him to pick fruit from the tree of life and live—for he*

98 Gen 2:23–24.
99 Matt 19:4–5.
100 Gen 1:28.
101 Gen 2:7.

could have lived forever if he had eaten once more, [*a fruit*] *from* [*the tree*] *of life. God did this, as we have stated, to keep evil from becoming immortal.*

31,9 *For if it was at all God's will that man die altogether without tasting life, why did God sent Christ from heaven to earth?* (10) *If my opponent should say that God did this because he had changed his mind, his argument would be feeble because it introduced a changeable God. But God is neither ignorant of the future nor malignant; indeed, he is supremely good, and foreknows that which is to come.* (11) *Thus God did not expel the man to prevent his eating from the tree of life and living forever, but so that sin would be killed first, by death. Then, with sin withered away after death, the man would arise cleansed and taste of life.*

32,1 *And no idiot should gamble that these things are meant in some other sense. For whoever decides that this flesh is incapable of immortality is indeed responsible for the ailment of his stupidity, and is a blasphemer.* (2) *If it were simply impossible for man to live forever without a body, why is Adam cast out after the making of the skin tunics, and kept from eating of the tree of life and living?* (3) *The prohibition is predicated on the assumption that, if he takes fruit from the tree of life and tastes it, he can avoid death. For scripture says, "And the Lord God made tunics of skin for Adam and his wife, and clothed them. And God said, Behold, Adam hath become as one of us, to know good and evil. And now, lest he put forth his hand and take of the tree of life and eat and live forever. And the Lord God sent him forth from the delight of Paradise to till the ground whence he was taken, and he cast Adam out."*[102]

32,4 *Thus the body could have lived forever and been immortal if it had not been prevented from tasting life. But it was prevented so that sin would be put to death with the body and die, but the body would rise washed clean of sin.* (5) *As I said, God made the body mortal by clothing it with mortality to keep man from being an immortal evil with the conquering sin alive in him forever—as it would be if it had sprouted in an immortal body and had immortal nourishment.* (6) *Hence the skin tunics—so that, through the body's destruction and its separation* [*from the soul*]*, the sin underneath it would perish entirely, from the root up, leaving not even the smallest bit of root for new shoots of sins to sprout from again.*

33,1 *If a fig tree* < *has* > *taken root and grown tall and broad in the beautiful buildings of a temple, and has covered all the joints of the stones with intricate roots, its growth cannot be halted until it is uprooted altogether,*

---

[102] Gen 3:21–24.

and the stones in the places where it sprouted are destroyed. (2) *For the stones can be set back in the same places once the fig tree is removed, so that the temple will be preserved and no longer harbor any of the ills that were destroying it. But as the fig tree has been uprooted altogether, it will die.* (3) *Thus, with the temporary visitations of death, God, the architect, destroyed his temple, man, who had sprouted sin like a wild fig—"killing and making alive,"*[103] *as the scripture says—so that, once the sin had withered and died, the flesh would rise again from the same places like a temple restored, immortal and unharmed because the sin had perished altogether from the ground up.*

33,4 *While the body is still alive before death, sin of necessity lives within us and conceals its roots within us, even though it is checked on the outside by the cuts of cautions and admonitions. For after his enlightenment no one can do further wrong; sin has simply been removed from us altogether.* (5) *However, we often find ourselves in sins even after coming to faith and the water of purification. For no one will boast that he is so free of sin that he never even thinks of wrong at all.*

33,6 *Thus, as matters stand, sin is reduced and lulled to sleep by faith, and cannot bear harmful fruit; but it has certainly not been destroyed roots and all.* (7) *Here we remove its flowerings—evil thoughts, for example—"lest any root of bitterness trouble us,"*[104] *and we do not let them open, opening their closed pores to suckers. For like an ax the word chops sin's roots off as they grow below. Then, however, even the thought of evil will be done away.*

34,1 *Nor does the text of scripture fail to witness to this, for those who sincerely desire to hear the truth. The apostle knows that the root of sin is still not entirely removed from men, and declares, "I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing. For to will is present with me, but how to perform what is good I find not. For the good that I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that do I. If, then, I do that which I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me."*[105] (2) *And "I delight in the law of God after the inward man. But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members."*[106]

34,3 *Thus sin has not yet been entirely dug out by the roots, but is alive.* (*For it is not wholly dead; how can it be, before the man is clothed with death?*)

---

[103] Deut 32:39.
[104] Heb 12:15.
[105] Rom 7:18–20.
[106] Rom 7:22–23.

[*It is alive*], *to wither and fade with the man, and to be utterly destroyed and perish—like a plant, when* < *the stone* > *is destroyed in* < *the place* > *where, as I said, it preserved its roots by* concealing *them. But the man will rise again, with no further "root of bitterness"*[107] *lurking within him.*

34,4 *For death and destruction were employed as an antidote by our true protector and physician, God, for the uprooting of sin. Otherwise evil would be eternal in us, like an immortal thing growing in immortals, and we ourselves would live like the diseased for a a long time, maimed and deprived of our native virtue, as persons who harbor the severe diseases of sin in everlasting and immortal bodies.* (5) *It is a good thing then, that God has devised death—this cure, like a medicinal purgative, of both soul and body—to leave us altogether spotless and unharmed.*

35,1 *Now then, since a number of illustrations of such matters are needed, let us by all means look for them, and not leave off until our argument ends with a clearer explanation and proof.* (2) *It is plainly just as though the best of artists were to remelt a lovely likeness he had made of gold or another material with all its limbs in proportion for beauty's sake, because he suddenly realized that it had been mutilated by some vicious person, who injured the piece because, from malice, he could not bear that it be beautiful, and reaped the empty fruit of envy.* (3) *With your great wisdom, Aglaophon, observe that if the artist did not want the piece he had created with so much zeal and care to be completely ruined and an eyesore, he would be well advised to melt it down again and make it as it was before.* (4) *If he did not remelt and refashion it, however, but* < *merely* > *patched and repaired it and left it as it is, the piece, which was hardened in the fire and cast in bronze, could never be kept the same, but would be altered, and diminished in value.*

35,5 *Thus if he wanted his work to be entirely good and flawless, he must break it up and recast it, so that the flaws, and all the alterations produced in it by treachery and envy, would be done away by its destruction and recasting, but the sculpture restored undamaged and unblemished to its own form, once more exactly like itself.* (6) *For even if it is dissolved back into its raw material, in the hands of the same artist the statue cannot be destroyed, but can be restored. Its blemishes and mutilations can be destroyed, however, for they are melted. They cannot be restored, for in every art the best craftsman looks, not to the ugliness of his work or its accidental flaws, but to its symmetry and tightness.*

---

[107] Heb 12:15.

35,7 *For it seems to me that God has dealt with us in the same way. He saw his handsomest work, man, spoiled by the malicious plots of envy, and in his lovingkindness could not bear to leave him like that, or he would be flawed forever and marred with an immortal blemish. He has reduced him to his raw material again, so that all his flaws may be melted and done away with by the refashioning.* (8) *For the remelting of the sculpture in my metaphor stands for the death and dissolution of the body; and the remodeling and reshaping of the material stands for the resurrection.* (9) *The prophet Jeremiah himself has already made the same recommendation in the following passage: "And I went down to the house of the potter, and lo, he was making a work upon the stones. And the vessel he was making broke in his hands, and again he made it another vessel, as it pleased him to do. And the word of the Lord came unto me saying, Can I not make you as this potter, O house of Israel? Behold, as the potter's clay are ye in my hands."*[108]

36,1 *Observe that, after the man's transgression, the great hand of God did not choose to abandon its work forever, like a counterfeit coin, to the evil one who had unjustly harmed it by reason of his envy. Instead it melted and reduced it to clay once more, like a potter reshaping a vessel to remove all its flaws and cracks by the reshaping, but make it once again entirely flawless and acceptable.* (2) *"Or hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor";*[109] *in other words—for I am sure that this is what the apostle means—does God not have the power to reshape and refashion each of us from the same raw material and raise us each individually, to our honor and glory or to our shame and condemnation? To the shame of those who have lived wickedly in sins, but to the honor of those who have lived in righteousness.* (3) *This was revealed to Daniel also, who says, "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall arise, some to eternal life, some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that are wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament."*[110]

36,4 *It is not in our power to remove the root of wickedness entirely, but to prevent it from spreading and bearing fruit. Its full and complete destruction, roots and all, is accomplished by God, as I said, at the dissolution of the body; but its partial destruction, so that it will not bud, is accomplished by ourselves.* (5) *And thus whoever fosters the increase and growth of wickedness*

---

108 Jer 18:3–6.
109 Rom 9:21.
110 Dan 12:2–3.

instead, but does not make it as barren as he can and reduce its size, must pay the penalty. For though he had the ability and the right to do this, he chose to prefer the harmful to the helpful.

37,1 *Thus no one, with wagging tongue, may blame the Godhead for not giving each his just reward for vice or virtue; the man himself is at fault. "Who art thou, O man, that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?"*[111] (2) *How can it? The man chose evil of his own free will! He may not ask the God who judges < with > unvaryingly righteous decrees, "Why hast thou made me to be thus condemned to torment?"*

37,3 *For note how, by deftly darting brief quotations, like a spearman, into the body of his words, Paul makes the interpretation of the readings unclear and extremely difficult, although they are entirely true and orthodox and contain nothing careless or evil.*[112] (4) *To those who look into the words with no zeal but mean-spiritedly, they sometimes seem disjointed and inconsistent; but to those who do this zealously and with sober reason, they are correspondingly full of order and truth.* (5) *Only a treatise in itself would be enough for a full and accurate discussion of this at this time. Indeed, it would be ridiculous to abandon your inquiry which has led me to compose this, and shift to other subjects.*

37,6 *For I have said this because of the justice which punishes willful evildoers. But now that we have made it abundantly clear that death was not devised for man's harm but < for his good* >, whoever opens this book with a good will must have an understanding of the resurrection of the body.* (7)[113] *How can death not be beneficial, when it destroys the things that prey upon our nature? Even though it is unpleasant at the time, while it is being administered, it < is > plainly a medicine, of a very bitter sort, for the patient.* (8) *But now then! Not to make the same points time and again about the same things, let us further confirm what we have said from the Song in Deuteronomy, and then go on to take up the rest.*

38,1 *For what does God's "I shall kill, and I shall make alive; I shall smite and I shall heal, and there is none that shall deliver out of my hand,"*[114] *mean to teach but that the body is first killed and dies, so that it may rise and live again?* (2) *It is struck and shattered first, so that it may be remade*

---

[111] Rom 9:20; Isa 29:16.

[112] The quotation Methodius means is that of Isa 29:16 at Rom 9:20. The subject he declines to discuss is presumably that of predestination.

[113] The next two paragraphs are renumbered to correct a numbering error in Holl.

[114] Deut 32:19.

sound and whole. (3) *And nothing has any power whatever to take it from God's great and mighty hand for ruin and destruction—not fire, not death, not darkness, not chaos, not corruption.* (4) *"Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?" says scripture—("Christ" means the Father's Hand and Word.) "Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, For thy sake are we killed all day long; we are counted as sheep appointed to be slain. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us."*[115]

38,5 *Absolutely true! This serves as the fulfillment of "I shall kill, and I shall make alive"—as I said—"I shall smite and I shall heal. "And there is no one to "take us," for our destruction, "from the love of God that is in Christ Jesus." Thus we are "reckoned as sheep for the slaughter," "to die to sin and live to God."*[116] *So much for this line of inquiry; here, once again, we must take up the next question.*

39,1 *Suppose that, as my opponent proposes, every procreated thing is ill in its origin and diet—for it increases in size from what is added to it, and becomes smaller because of what is subtracted from it. But whatever is not procreated is in good health, since it is not ill and has no needs or desires. Procreated things, however, desire both sex and food, but to have desires is illness, while to have no needs or desires is health. And procreated things are ill because they have desires, while things not procreated are not ill. And things that are ill suffer from a surplus or deficiency of the things which are added to them or taken away from them. Now anything that suffers both withers and perishes, since it is procreated. But man is procreated. Therefore man cannot be impassible and immortal.*

39,2 *But even as stated, the argument fails. If everything must perish if it is either brought into being or procreated—we may as well say it this way, because the first man and woman were not procreated, but were brought into being, but both angels and souls are brought into being for the scripture says, "He maketh his angels spirits"*[117]*—then, on their premises, angels and souls must perish!* (3) *But neither angels nor souls perish; they are immortal and indestructible as their maker intends them to be. Man too, therefore, is immortal.*

39,4 *No more satisfactory is the argument that all things will be destroyed completely and there will be no more earth, air and heaven. The whole world*

---

[115] Rom 8:35–37.
[116] Rom 6:10.
[117] Ps 103:4.

will be overwhelmed with a deluge of fire, and burned to ashes for its purification and renewal, but will certainly not come to entire destruction and dissolution. (5) *If the non-existence of the world is better than its existence, why did God make the poorer choice and create the world'? But God made nothing to no purpose or inferior.* (6) *Thus God ordered the creation in such a way that it would exist and endure, as Wisdom proves by saying, "God hath created all things to exist, and sound are the origins of the world; in them is no poison of destruction."*[118] (7) *And Paul plainly testifies to this with his words, "The earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope, because creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of destruction to the glorious liberty of the children of God."*[119] (8) *Here he chooses to call this world a "creature," and says that "the creature was made subject to vanity," but that it expects to be set free from such bondage. For it is not the invisible things that are enslaved to corruption, but these, the visible ones.*

39,9 *The "creature," then, endures, renewed once more and in a comelier form, and is joyous and glad for the sons of God at the resurrection, though now it groans for them and shares their travail, while it too awaits our redemption from the perishability of the body.* (10) *Then, when we are raised and have shaken off the mortality of our flesh—as scripture says, "Shake off the dust, rise and sit down, O Jerusalem"*[120]*—and when we are set free from sin, it too will be set free from corruption and no longer enslaved to "vanity," but to righteousness.* (11) *"For we know," says scripture, "that all creation groaneth and travaileth together in pain until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body."*[121]

39,12 *And Isaiah says, "For as the new heavens and the new earth which I make remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name be."*[122] *And again, "Thus saith the Lord that created the heavens, this God that formed the earth and made it. He established its bounds, he created it not in vain, but to be inhabited."*[123] (13) *Indeed God has not created the world*

---

118 Wisd Sol 1:14.
119 Rom 8:19–20.
120 Isa 52:2.
121 Rom 8:22–23.
122 Isa 66:22.
123 Isa 45:18.

to no purpose or in vain, for destruction, as those who think vain thoughts would have it. He has made it to be, to be inhabited and to abide. Therefore heaven and earth must once more be, after the burning up and boiling away of all things. (14) *To explain the necessity of this would require an even longer discussion. For after its dissolution the universe will not be reduced to inert matter, and its state before its establishment. Nor, again, will it be reduced to total destruction and decay.*

40,1 *But suppose our opponents say, "If the universe will not be destroyed, why did the Lord say that heaven and earth would pass away? And why did the prophet say that the heaven would perish like smoke, and the earth grow old like a garment'?"*[124]

40,2 *"Because," we shall reply, "scripture's way is to call the world's change from its present state to a better and more glorious one a 'destruction,' like the change of anything to a more glorious form when its previous form is done away with; there is no contradiction or anomaly in the sacred scripture.* (3) *'The form of this world passeth away,'*[125] *but the world does not. Thus scripture's way is to call the change of a previous form to a better, and sometimes a lovelier one, a 'destruction,'* (4) *as one might call the change from one's form in babyhood to maturity a 'destruction' because the stature of the infant is changed in its size and handsomeness. "For when I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things."*[126]

40,5 *We would expect the creature to be troubled because it is to die in the conflagration and be created anew, but we would not expect it to perish. Thus we, the newly created, shall dwell free from sorrow in the newly created world—as the hundred and third Psalm says, "Thou shalt send forth thy Spirit and they shall be made, and thou shalt renew the face of the earth"*[127]*—with God at last, the regulator of its mild climate, surrounding it.* (6) *For if there is to be an earth even after this age, there is every necessity that it also have inhabitants, who will never again die, marry and be born, but like the angels will unchangingly perform the best of works in immortality.* (7) *Thus it is silly to ask how bodies can exist then where there will be no air or earth or the rest.*

41,1 *But if we are to discuss such important matters with confidence, Aglaophon, something beyond what we have said is worth our looking into,*

---

[124] Ps 101:27.
[125] 1 Cor 7:13.
[126] 1 Cor 13:11.
[127] Ps 103:30.

since it occasions a great deal of error. (2) *After you said that, when the Sadducees tested him, the Lord declared that those who attain the resurrection will be like angels, you added, "But the angels, who have no flesh, are in the highest state of beatitude, and therefore also of glory. Thus if we are to equal the angels, we, like them, must be without flesh."* (3) *But, Sir, you have not understood that He who created the universe from nothing and set it in order, did not adorn it by allotting the nature of immortals to angels and ministers only, but to principalities, authorities and thrones as well.* (4) *The angels are one species and the principalities and authorities are another, for there is not* [*just*] *one rank, condition, tribe and family of immortals, but different species, tribes and varieties. The cherubim cannot relinquish their own nature and be changed into the form of angels; nor, in turn, can angels be changed into some other form. They must be the same as they are and have been.*

41,5 *But man too, who was charged* < *at* > *the first ordering of the universe to inhabit the world and rule all its denizens—man is immortal and will never be changed from his manhood into the form of the angels or any of the others. For no more can the angels be changed from their original form and turned into that of the others.* (6) *Christ did not come to announce the remaking or transformation of human nature into some other, but its change into its original nature before its fall, when it was immortal.* (7) *Each created thing must remain in its own assigned place, so that all may be filled with all: the heavens with angels; the thrones with powers; the luminaries with ministering spirits; the most sacred places and the pure and undefiled lights, with the seraphim who stand beside the great Will which controls the universe; and the world with men.* (8) *But if we grant that men are changed into angels, it is time to say that the angels can also be changed into powers, and the powers into one thing and another, until the ascending list incurs risk.*[128]

42,1 *But it is not as though God made man inferior or slipped up in the process of fashioning him, and like the poorest of workmen later changed his mind and decided to make him an angel; or that he meant to make an angel at first and could not, but made a man. This is incompetence.* (2) *If he wanted the man to become an angel and not a man, why ever did he make him a man and not an angel? Because he couldn't?* < *This* > *is blasphemy!* (3) *But did he put off doing the better thing and do the worse? This too is absurd. God neither makes mistakes nor puts off doing a good thing, nor*

[128] I.e., reaches the point of suggesting that something may become God.

lacks the power [*to do it*]. *He has the power to do both as he wills and when he wills, for God is Power.*

42,4 *Very well, God created the man at the first and willed that he be a man. But if he willed it, and he wills what is good—and if man is good—and if man is said to be composed of soul and body—then man will not be bodiless* [*at the resurrection*] *but embodied, or man will be other than man.* (5) *For the immortal species must all be preserved by God. But man too is immortal, for Wisdom says, "God created man for immortality, and made him by his own eternity."*[129] *The body does not perish, then, for man is body and soul.*

43,1 *Understand, then, that the Lord meant to teach these very things, because the Sadducees did not believe in the resurrection of the flesh. This is Sadducean doctrine, and so, to decry the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh, they made up the parable of the woman and the seven brothers, and came to him.* (*The evangelist, of course, added "came to him" himself, when he said, "Likewise Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection, came to him."*)[130] (2) *Now if there were no resurrection of flesh but only the soul were saved, Christ would have agreed that their opinion was good and right. But he refutes them instead by saying, "In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as angels in heaven*[131]—(3) *not by having no flesh, but by neither marrying nor being married but finally being immortal, and among the luminaries. They will be very like the angels in this respect—that, like the angels in heaven, we in Paradise will not spend our time in weddings and banquets, but in seeing God and enjoying eternal life under Christ's headship.*

43,4 *For Christ did not say, "They shall be angels," but, "They shall be like angels"—as* [*in the scriptural text*], *"crowned with glory and honor and but a little different from the angels,"*[132] *and nearly angels.* (5) *It is as though one were to say that on a balmy, calm night when all was illuminated with the moon's heavenly radiance, the moon shone "like" the sun. We would certainly not say he was testifying that the moon "was" the sun, but that it was "like" the sun,* (6) *just as a material which is not gold but gold< en> is not said to be "gold," but "like gold." If it were gold, it would not be called "golden" but "gold"; but since it is not gold, but is < almost > gold and looks like gold, it is not called "gold" but "golden."*

---

129 Wisd Sol 2:23.
130 Matt 22:23.
131 Matt 22:30.
132 Ps 8:6.

43,7 *Thus, when Christ says that the saints will be as angels in the resurrection, we do not understand him to be promising that the saints will actually be angels in the resurrection, but that they will nearly be angels.* (8) *And it is the height of absurdity to deny the resurrection of bodies because Christ declared that the saints will look like angels in the resurrection, although the word itself clearly indicates the nature of the event.*

43,9 *For "rising" is not said of a thing that has not fallen, but of one that has fallen and gets up, as the prophet says, "And I will raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen."*[133] *But the beloved tabernacle of the soul has fallen "to dusty earth,*[134] *for it is not the undying thing that topples over, but the thing that dies. It is flesh that dies, for the soul is immortal.* (10) *Now then, if the soul is immortal and the dead man is a body, those who say that there is a resurrection, but not a resurrection of the flesh, are denying that there is a resurrection. For it is not the thing that has been standing that rises, but the thing that has fallen and dropped, as scripture says, "Doth that which falleth not rise, or shall that which turneth away not turn back?"*[135]

44,1 *Now the Lord has plainly taught that the soul is immortal, both in his own words and through the mouth of Solomon. He has taught it in his own words in the story of the rich man and the poor man Lazarus, by showing the one at rest in Abraham's bosom after the discarding of his body, but the other in torments which he described in conversation with Abraham.* (2) *And he taught it through Solomon in the book entitled Wisdom, where it is written that "The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God and there shall no torment touch them. In the sight of the unwise they seemed to die and their departure was taken for misery, and their going from us for utter destruction. But they are in peace, and their hope is full of immortality."*[136] (3) *Thus resurrection is of a body, not of a soul. One does not raise a person who is on his feet but a person who is lying down, just as not a healthy individual, but a sufferer is doctored.*

44,4 *And if anyone insists that resurrection will apply to the soul and not the flesh, this is a lot of foolishness and nonsense. One must first prove a corresponding decay and dissolution of the soul to prove its resurrection as well, and not by talking nonsense but by the clear statement of a plain fact.* (5) *But no matter, let us allow him to declare the soul mortal. Here we must make one of two assumptions. Either the Lord's declaration is untrue when*

---

133 Amos 9:11.
134 Dan 12:2.
135 Jer 8:5.
136 Wisd Sol 3:1–4.

he teaches that the soul is immortal, and whoever says that it does not perish is lying; or else it perishes, and Christ is < telling > a lie by teaching both in his story of the rich man and the poor man and in the vision of Moses and Elijah, that it is indestructible and immortal. (6) *But the Lord has never contradicted himself or lied. He was not showing an image or simulacrum of Elijah and Moses on the mount with the intent of deceiving the apostles, but showing truthfully what they were. So even the slowest learner, as we might say, can learn that he is immortal, and affirm the indestructibility of the soul.*

45,1 *Resurrection, then, is a resurrection of the flesh and not of the soul, so that the tabernacle of David which has fallen into decay may arise and, risen and rebuilt, remain undamaged and unfallen for all eternity.* (2) *For God was not concerned that David's stone house be built to give him a fine home in the kingdom of heaven, but that his flesh, the tabernacle of the soul, be built, which he had fashioned with his own hands.*

45,3 *With your immense wisdom, Aglaophon, you must regard it in this way. You are sure to understand it very easily if you think of the image of going to sleep and getting up. If going to sleep results from waking and getting up results from sleeping, and this is a rehearsal for death and resurrection—"to the twins, sleep and death!"*[137]*—then, since rising results from* [*the sleep of*] *sleepers, the quickening to life of the flesh must be the result of death.* (4) *For if waking issues from sleep, and the sleeper certainly does not just go on sleeping in the same posture but gets up again, so life will issue from death; and the man who dies surely does not remain so because he dies.* (5) *For if waking issues from sleep, rising from falling and rebuilding from destruction, how can we possibly not expect the resurrection of the fallen and the quickening of the dead?*

45,6 *And observe, if you will, not only from sleeping and rising but from seeds and shoots as well, how the resurrection is proclaimed in them all. Note how seeds are put into the ground "bare,"*[138] *as the scripture says, without any flesh, and, rendered back again mature. If seeds died and decayed, but there were no more revival and sprouting of the seeds, why would it not be the lot of all things to be dissolved in death?*

46,1 *But for now, "most excellent Theophilus,"*[139] *and you other judges of the debate, I shall forbear to say more about this. Let us take up his next*

---

137 Iliad 16.672.
138 1 Cor 15:37.
139 Luke 1:3.

points as well, since they are far from satisfactory. (2) *For again, in my opponent's forced, unnatural interpretation of the prophecy in the sixty-fifth Psalm, God takes sinners' actual souls, and as punishment for their sins puts them < into > the flesh as into a "snare."*[140] *But rather than orthodoxy, this is absurdity.* (3) *If the souls had possessed bodies before the transgression, as I have already pointed out, why would they be stuffed into bodies later, after their transgression, < as > into a snare? There was no time for them to sin before they got their bodies.*

46,4 *It makes no sense to say one minute that the souls have sinned because of the body, and the next that the body was made for condemnation as a prison and a snare, because they had sinned.* (5) *If they sinned because of the body, then the body was with them from the first, even before the sin. For how could they sin because of something which was not yet in existence?* (6) *But again, if the body itself is regarded as a snare, chains and a prison, the combination* [*of body and soul*] *cannot be responsible for the sin; it must be the soul alone. For bonds, snares and chains are made for the sinner after his sin.*

46,7 *But we have agreed that the body cannot be the prison of the soul, since the body cooperates with either sort of behavior, right or wrong, but a prison prevents wrong behavior.* (8) *So as I say, one of two alternatives must be true. Either we sinned with a body from the first, and can find no time when we were without a body; and the body shares the responsibility for good and evil actions with the soul. Or else we sinned when we were without a body, and the body is not responsible for evil at all.* (9) *And yet the soul cannot be mastered by irrational pleasure without a body; but our first parents were mastered and snared by irrational pleasure. Thus even before its sin, the soul was accompanied by a body.*

46,10 *As to the unthinkability of the body's being made as a prison to punish the transgression, leaving the soul, as our opponents say, with the unmitigated, constant torture of carrying a corpse, I believe I have now given a full demonstration of this with every possible proof.* (11) *Thus it is untenable and unacceptable to make of the body a snare and chains, and say that God brings the souls into the snare as punishment, after casting them down from the third heaven for their transgressions of his commandment.*

46,12 *For what could one be thinking of to believe the things they have so rashly said? And this although, despite their forced interpretation of it, the psalm does not have this meaning. I shall quote its actual words to show*

---

[140] Ps 65:11.

what fiction their exposition is, since they have no desire to understand the scriptures correctly.

46,13 *The psalm goes something like this: "Thou hast proved us, O God, thou hast tried us like as silver is tried. Thou broughtest us into the snare, and laidest tribulations upon our back. Thou sufferedst men to ride over our heads. We went through fire and water, and thou broughtest us out to refreshment."*[141] (14) *And they add at once, "This is said by souls which have been cast down from the third heaven, where Paradise is, into the snare of the body as into a contest." For they say that "We went through fire and water" may mean either the soul's passage from the womb into the world, since it has its dwelling in the midst of much fire and moisture—or else it may mean the soul's fall from the heavens into the world, when < it > passes into the world through the fire, and the waters above the firmament.*

46,15 *I have decided to stand up to these people. Now then, Aglaophon, answer for them yourself* [*and tell us*] *what they will say.* (47,1) *For in the first place, Paradise, from which, in the person of our first ancestor, we were expelled, is obviously a particular place on this earth, set apart for the untroubled rest and residence of the saints. < This > is plain from the fact that the Tigris and Euphrates, and the other rivers that issue from it, can be seen here inundating our land with their flooding.* (2) *They do not pour down in a cataract from the sky; the earth could not even sustain such a weight of water pouring down all at once from on high.*

47,3 *Nor, to those who can recognize the nuances of words, is the apostle suggesting that Paradise is in a third heaven. He says, "I know < such a man > caught up to the third heaven; and I know such a man,* (*whether in the body or out of the body, God knoweth*), *that he was rapt away to Paradise."*[142] (4) *He is declaring that he has seen two great revelations and been taken up visibly twice, once to the third heaven and once to Paradise. "I know such a man caught up to the third heaven" is proof that a particular revelation was shown him in the third heaven, when he was caught up.* (5) *And the next sentence, "And I know such a man,* (*whether in the body, or out of the body*), *< rapt away > to Paradise," proves that one more revelation was shown him in Paradise.*

47,6 *It is jabber and rant, then, to speak of the souls' being cast down from the heavens, passing through the sources of fire and the waters above the firmament, and falling into this world.* (7) *Besides, Adam was not expelled*

---

141 Ps 65:10–12.
142 2 Cor 12:2–4.

from the heavens, but from the Paradise planted in the east, in Eden. For his transgression did not precede his embodiment, as I have shown sufficiently already, and this body is not a snare. The transgression came after the soul's union with the body, for man is a composite of the two; and the fall from Paradise took place here. (8) *But he* (Origen?) *did not examine the passage with any care at all, Aglaophon. He employed his skill in things which are not without risk, and set out to interpret the psalm in accordance with the opinions of low people, of whom I forbear to say more.*

48,1 *But now that I have come to the point of correcting their depravity, I should also like to explain to them the reason for this prophecy, "Thou hast proved us, O God. Thou hast tried us with fire as silver is tried."*[143] (2) *The martyrs, during their trials, were amply tested by the assaults of their tortures—for the most part, the prophecies are fulfilled in our faith. They thank God that they have fought the battle out honorably and with great courage, and say to him, "Thou hast proved us, o God. Thou hast tried us with fire as silver is tried," as though God, bent on victory in the true Olympics, tested them with many sufferings, enabling them to win greater glory in his eyes.*

48,3 *And see how Solomon calls out in praise of martyrs, in plain agreement with these words—for the line does not go uncorroborated by the testimony of other scriptures. "God proved them and found them worthy of himself. As gold in the furnace he tried them and received them as an whole burnt offering of sweet savor. And in the time of their visitation < they shall shine >."* (4) *And before that he had said, "And though they are punished in the sight of men, their hope is full of immortality. And being a little chastened they shall be greatly rewarded."*[144]

48,5 *Moreover, in the hundred and twenty-third Psalm it is the martyrs who sing "If the Lord had not been in our midst when men rose up against us, they had swallowed us up alive. The water had drowned us, our soul had passed through a torrent, our soul had passed through bottomless water. Blessed be the Lord, who hath not given us for a prey unto their teeth. Our soul was delivered as a sparrow from the snare of the fowlers. The snare is broken and we are delivered."*[145]

48,6 *There are two choirs of victorious martyrs, one of the New Testament and the other of the Old, who with one accord sing their antiphonal hymn to*

---

143 Ps 65:10–11.
144 Wisd Sol 3:4–7.
145 Ps 123:2–7.

God, their champion and the King of all: "Thou hast proved us, O God, thou hast tried us with fire as silver is tried. Thou broughtest us into the snare, thou laidest crushing burdens upon our backs."[146] *Those* [*burdens*] *were the tribunal of the heathen, or the tortures in which they were hard pressed by crushing and burning.* (7) *For scripture says, "Test me, O Lord, and prove me, try my reins and my heart."*[147]

48,8 *Well might Abraham say, "Thou hast proved us, O Lord; thou hast tried us by fire as silver is tried,"*[148] *after hearing "Abraham, spare thy son,"*[149] *and throwing his sword away.* (9) *His heart had ached for his only son, though he honored God's command above < his child >. After Job's flesh had run with filth and his friends had reproached him, and after his body was in pain, well might Job say, "Thou hast set tribulations before us, o Lord, that thou mayest try us as gold in the furnace,"*[150] *on hearing God ask him from the whirlwind, "Or thinkest thou that I have dealt with thee otherwise than that thou mightest be found righteous?"*[151] (10) *And well might the three children in the furnace, sprinkled with dew to prevent their consumption by the fire, say, "Thou hast proved us, O God, thou hast tried us with fire as the silver is tried. We went through fire and water, and thou broughtest us out to a place of refreshment."*[152]

48,11 *Grant, O almighty God, the great, the eternal, the Father of Christ, that in thy day I too, Methodius, may pass unharmed through the fire and the waters turned to fuel, escape their onslaughts, and say, "I went through fire and water, and thou broughtest me out to refreshment."* (12) *For thy promise to those who love thee is, "If thou passest through the water I am with thee, and the rivers shall not overwhelm thee. If thou passest through the fire thou shalt not be burned; flame shall not scorch thee."*[153] *But so much for the exposition of the psalm.*

49,1 *But further, we must examine the argument in which, like sleepers dreaming many impostures, they declare that Paul said, "I was alive without the Law once,"*[154] *and loudly insist < that > by his life "before the commandment" he meant his life in the first man < in Paradise >, before the body. And*

---

146 Ps 65:10–11.
147 Ps 25:2.
148 Ps 65:10.
149 Cf. Gen 22:11–12.
150 Cf. Ps 65:10.
151 Job 40:3.
152 Ps 65:12.
153 Isa 43:2.
154 Rom 7:9.

the words he adds, "But I am fleshly, sold under sin,"[155] *confirm this.* (2) *For the man could not have been ruled and mastered by evil, and sold to it for his transgression, if he had not become fleshly; in itself, the soul is immune to sin. And thus, after first saying "I was alive without the Law once," Paul acutely added, "But I am fleshly, sold under sin."*

49,3 *Awe and consternation overcame the masses when they said these things, but now that the truth has come to light it is plain, not only that they have gone far wrong, but that they have ascended even to the height of blasphemy.* (4) *By granting that the souls had lived without bodies before the commandment, and supposing them completely immune to sin in themselves, they have once more demolished their own argument—or, far more, their own selves. For they make it out that the bodies < were given > to the souls later, as a punishment, because they had sinned before they had bodies. And indeed they have been moved to abuse, and compare the body with a prison and chains, and < set about* > *saying other silly things.*

49,5 *In fact, as has been said, the precise opposite is true; before the sin the soul must have a body. For if the soul in itself were immune to sin, it would not sin at all before it had a body.* (6) *But if it sinned, it cannot in itself be immune to sin, but must even be susceptible and prone to it. And therefore—again—it will sin even without getting the body, just as it sinned before it got one.*

49,7 *But why did it get a body at all later on, after it had sinned? Why did it need a body? If it was for torture and pain, why does it revel with the body instead, and behave licentiously?* (8) *And why does it plainly even have the freedom to make choices in this world? For here it is in our power to believe and not to believe, to do right and to sin, to do good and to do evil.*

49,9 *Moreover, how can the judgment still be on its way, in which God rewards everyone according to his works and behavior? Why not suppose that it is here already, if the soul's birth and entrance into a body is its judgment and retribution, whereas its death and separation from the body is its liberation and refection? For in your view it was put into a body as judgment and condemnation, for sinning before it had a body.* (10) *But my argument has more than amply shown that it is inadmissible to regard the body as the soul's torture chamber and chain.*

50,1 *To end our discussion of this here, one would need only to show from the scripture itself that, < even > before his transgression, the first man was composed of body and soul. I too shall go over the heads of this now, trying*

[155] Rom 7:14.

< only >* *to correct the bases of their arguments, and thus not exceed the length suitable for speeches.*

50,2 *For you can see at once, gentlemen of the jury, that as the words which follow it indicate, the verse from Romans, "I was alive once without the Law,"*[156] *cannot apply to the life they claim the soul had before the body—even though, because he suffers from a completely incurable childhood ailment, this good physician of the texts forcibly changed the sense as he saw fit by removing the next lines.* (3) *For instead of keeping bodies' limbs next to their natural junctures and joints, and leaving the appearance of the body just right, as nature intended, he mutilated it, like a Scythian mercilessly hacking an enemy's limbs off for his destruction, by ignoring the order of scripture.*

50,4 *"All right," they will say, "if you have proved that this is not what they mean, why did the apostle make these declarations?"*

"Because he regarded the 'commandment' as 'law,'" I would reply. "(Let us grant first that, as you suppose, he called the commandment an actual 'law.') But Paul did not suppose because of this that, before the commandment, our first parents also lived without bodies; he supposed that they lived without sin. (5) *Indeed the time between their creation and the commandment, during which they lived without sin, was short—*[*this time during which*] *they lived, not without bodies but with bodies. Thus they were expelled directly after the commandment, after a very brief youth in Paradise."*

50,6 *But suppose that someone seizes on the line which says, "When we were in the flesh, the motions of sins which were by the Law did work in our members," believes that Paul is accusing and repudiating the flesh; and suppose that he brings up all the other things of this kind that Paul said,* (7) *such as, "that the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us, which walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit."*[157] *Or, "For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh, but they that are after the Spirit, the things of the Spirit. For to be fleshly minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the fleshly mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither again can it be. < So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God >. But ye are not in the flesh but in the Spirit."*[158] (8) *We should ask him whether the apostle, and the persons to whom he wrote*

156 Rom 7:9.
157 Rom 8:4.
158 Rom 8:5–9.

this, had already departed this life, if he was here decrying, not life lived in fleshly terms, but the flesh itself-—or whether he was still in the flesh.

50,9 *But it cannot be said that he sent this when he was not in the flesh. Both he and the addressees were plainly in the flesh. But in that case how can he say, "When we were in the flesh the motions of the sins that were by the Law did work in our members," as though neither he himself, nor the addressees, were still in the flesh?* (10) *He is speaking not of the flesh itself but of a dissolute life. It is his habit to call a person who lives such a life "fleshly," just as he calls one who is hardened to the beholding of the truth and the light of the mystery, "soulish."*

50,11 *For* [*on their premises*] *they should say that neither can the soul ever be saved! Scripture says, "The soulish man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things."*[159] (12) *< Thus > in that case a soulish and a spiritual man are introduced, and the spiritual < is adjudged* * *> as saved while the soulish < is adjudged* * *> as lost, but this does not mean that the soul perishes and everything besides the soul is saved. So here,* (I.e., at Rom. 5:8–9) *when Paul says that the fleshly, and those who are in the flesh, must perish and cannot please God, he is not striving for the destruction of the flesh, but the destruction of the fleshly mode of life.*

50,13 *And further on, when he says, "They that are in the flesh cannot please God," he adds at once, "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you."*[160] (14) *And shortly after that, "But because the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you. Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh to live after the flesh. For if ye live afier the flesh ye shall die; but if ye, through the Spirit, do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live."*[161] *As we must note, he maintained that the body's appetite for pleasures is put to death, and not the body itself.*

51,1 *But if they argue, "Then why is it said that 'The mind of the flesh is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can it be?'"*[162] *we must reply that here too they are mistaken.* (2) *Paul was not suggesting that the flesh itself cannot be subject to the law of God, but that the "mind" of the flesh cannot be, and this is different from the flesh.*

---

159 1 Cor 2:14–15.
160 Rom 8:8–9.
161 Rom 8:11–13.
162 Rom 8:7.

51,3 *It is as though he were to say, "The impurity in poorly refined silver is not subject to the craftsman for manufacture as a household vessel. It cannot be; it must be removed from the silver first, and melted out."* (4) *And he was not claiming because of this that the silver cannot be wrought into a serviceable vessel, but that the copper in the silver, and its other impurities, cannot be.* (5) *Thus when he spoke of the "mind of the flesh," he did not mean that the flesh cannot be subject to the law of God, but that the "mind" that is in the flesh cannot be—its impulse to incontinence, for example. Elsewhere he sometimes called this the "old leaven of malice and wickedness,"*[163] *and urged that it be entirely removed from us. But sometimes he called it the "law which warreth against the law of my mind and bringeth it into captivity."*[164]

51,6 *For in the first place, if he meant that the flesh itself cannot be subject to the law of God, no just judge could blame us for licentious behavior, banditry, and all the other deeds we perform or do with the body—there is no other way of refraining from sin—then it is not true that the body cannot be subject to the law of God! How could the body be blamed for living up to its own nature?*

51,7 *But besides, neither could the body be brought to purity or virtue, if it were not in its nature to be subject to the good. For if the nature of the flesh is such that it cannot be subject to the law of God,but righteousness is the law of God, and prudence, then no one at all could ever be a virgin or continent.* (8) *But if there are virgins and continent persons, but continence is achieved by the subjection of the body—there is no other way of refraining from sin—then it is not true that the body cannot be subject to the law of God.* (9) *How did John subject his body to purity? Or Peter to sanctity? And why does Paul say, "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof. Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin: but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God"?*[165] *And again, "For as ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity, unto iniquity; even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto holiness."*[166]

52,1 *Thus he knew that this tabernacle can be put to rights and assent to the good, so that the sins in it can be put to death.* (2) *Even with us, how can a man be the servant of righteousness if he does not first subject his fleshly*

---

163 1 Cor 7:8.
164 Rom 7:23.
165 Rom 6:12–13.
166 Rom 6:19.

members so that they will obey not sin but righteousness, and live worthily of Christ? Sinning and refraining from sin are accomplished through the body, and the soul employs it either as an instrument of virtue or an instrument of wickedness.

52,3 *For if "Neither fornicators, not idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners can inherit the kingdom of God"*[167]—(4) *and if these things are accomplished by the body and derive their strength from the body, and no one is justified without overcoming them first—and if the one who overcomes them is the one who inclines to prudence and faith—then the body is subject to the law of God. For prudence is the law of God.*

52,5 *Thus the apostle did not say that the flesh is not subject to the good but that the mind of the flesh is not, removing, as it were, the flesh's desire for immoderations, just as he removed the soul's desire for evil.* (6) *In his earnest effort to purge even the intemperance of gluttony, teaching us that such desires and pleasures must be utterly eliminated,* (7) *and shaming those who believe that luxury and feasting are life—persons "who regard their belly as God,"*[168] who < say >, *"Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die,"*[169] *and who spend their time like greedy cattle on nothing but feeding and dining–he said, "Meats for the belly and the belly for meats: but God will destroy both it and them."*[170] *And then he added, "Now the body is not for fornication, but for the Lord; and the Lord for the body. And God hath both raised up the Lord, and will raise up us by his power. What? Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? Shall I then take the members of Christ and make them the members of an harlot? God forbid! What? Know ye not that that which is joined to an harlot is one body? For two, saith he, shall be one flesh. But he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit. Flee fornication. Every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body. What? Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye were bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body."*[171]

53,1 *Note that the apostle made these statements because the body can < be subject > to the law of God, and can be immortal if it is kept free of*

---

[167] 1 Cor 6:9.
[168] Phil 3:19.
[169] 1 Cor 15:32.
[170] 1 Cor 6:13.
[171] 1 Cor 6:13–20.

the fuel of intemperance, and never soiled by forbidden stimulations of the passions. (2) *For what else is "joined to an harlot,"*[172] *has relations with her, becomes one flesh by the junction and union of their members, but this external body with which all the sins of sex and passion are committed?* (3) *This is why Paul said, "Every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body."*[173] (4) *Vanity, unbelief, anger and hypocrisy are sins of the soul, but fornication, passion and luxury are sins of the body. With these the soul can neither take refuge in the truth nor the body be subject to the teachings of prudence; both will slip away from the kingdom of Christ.*

53,5 *And therefore if our bodies, when kept holy, are the "temple of the Spirit that dwelleth in us"*[174] *and "The Lord is in the body,"*[175] *and the members of the body are the members of Christ, the body is subject to the divine law and "can inherit the kingdom of God."*[176] (6) *For "He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you,"*[177] *so that "This mortal shall put on immortality and this corruptible shall put on incorruption, and death will be swallowed up in victory."*[178] (7) *For the apostle was not discussing some other body here on earth, but this body which dies and is put to death, and with which fornication and other sins can be committed.*

54,1 *But what if they surmise that there is a difference between "body" and "flesh"—to allow them this argument as well—and suppose that "body" is something different and invisible, < the property > of the soul, as it were, but "flesh" is this external, visible body? We must reply that it is not only Paul and the prophets who understand this flesh as "body." Others do as well, < pagan > philosophers, who are the most particular about the accuracy of terms.* (2) *If our opponents will also make a scientific investigation of this, "flesh" is the right word—certainly not for the whole mass of our tabernacle, but for some part of the whole, like the bones, sinews and veins. The whole, though, is "body." And physicians, who deal with precision with the nature of bodies, understand "body" to mean this visible body.*

---

172 1 Cor 6:16.
173 1 Cor 6:18.
174 1 Cor 6:19.
175 Cf. 1 Cor 6:13.
176 1 Cor 6:15.
177 Rom 8:11.
178 1 Cor 15:53–54.

54,3 *Plato too, moreover, understands "body" to mean this actual < body >. Thus Socrates said in the Phaedo, "Do we suppose that death is anything other than < the > soul's departure from the body? And when the body has begun to exist separately by itself, apart from the soul, and the soul apart from the body, this is death."*[179]

54,4 *Did not the blessed Moses—we come now to the Lord's scriptures—understand "body" to mean the body we see, and say in the purifications that whoever touches something unclean "shall wash his clothes and bathe his body in water, and be unclean until even?"*[180] (5) *And what about Job? Did he too not understand "body" to mean this thing that dies, when he said, "My body is sullied with the rottenness of worms?"*[181] (6) *Solomon too said, "Wisdom will not enter into a soul that deviseth evil, nor make its abode in a body guilty of sin."*[182] *And in Daniel it is said of the martyrs, "The fire had no power upon their bodies, nor was an hair of their head singed."*[183]

54,7 *The Lord said too, in the Gospel, "Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought what ye shall eat or what ye shall put on. Is not the soul more than meat, and the body than raiment?"*[184] (8) *And the apostle proves that he understands "body" to mean this body of ours when he says, "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body."*[185] *And again, "If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall quicken your mortal bodies."*[186] (9) *And again, "If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body, is it therefore not of the body?*[187] *And again, "And being not weak in faith, Abraham considered not his own body now dead."*[188] *And again, "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ: that everyone may receive the things done in his body according to that he hath done."*[189] (10) *And again, "His letters are weighty and powerful; but the presence of his body is weak."*[190] *And again, "I knew a man in Christ fourteen years ago, whether in the body, I cannot*

---

179 Plato Phaedo 64C.
180 Lev 14:9; 47.
181 Job 7:5.
182 Wisd Sol. 1:4.
183 Dan 3:94.
184 Matt 6:25.
185 Rom 6:12.
186 Rom 8:11.
187 1 Cor 12:15.
188 Rom 4:19.
189 2 Cor 5:10.
190 2 Cor 10:10.

tell, or whether out of the body, I cannot tell."[191] *And again, So men ought to love their wives as their own bodies."*[192] *And again, "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."*[193]

54,11 *But our opponents have surely realized none of this. They supposed the apostle adrift on a stormy sea, as though his thoughts had no harbor and anchorage, but sailed back and forth making contradictory statements, sometimes that the flesh rises, but sometimes that it does not.*

55,1 *And so, to omit none of their propositions and hew < the> hydra all to pieces, I shall return to the subject. For next, as I promised, I shall put the other questions that they raise and show how to answer them, and prove that our opponent has said things that are themselves in accord and agreement with our faith in the resurrection of the flesh.* (2) *Let us see, then, what we were led at the outset to say of the apostle. As we originally suggested, his words, "I was alive without the Law once,"*[194] *mean our former life in Paradise in our first parents—not without a body but with a body—before the commandment.* (3) *For "God took the dust of the earth and fashioned the man"*[195] *before the giving of the commandment. We lived free from lust and knew no onslaughts of the senseless desire which, with the enticing distractions of pleasures, impels us to intemperance.* (4) *For if one has no rule to live by, and no control over his own reason, what life can he choose to live, to merit just praise or blame? He must be pronounced immune to all charges, since one cannot covet things that are not forbidden.* (5) *And even if he does covet them, he will not be charged. "Covet" does not apply to things which are accessible and at one's command, but to accessible things which are not in one's power. How can one desire and itch for a thing which is not withheld from him, and which he does not need? Thus < Paul said >, "I had not known lust if the Law had not said, Thou shalt not covet."*[196]

55,6 *But when our first parents had been told, "Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil ye shall not eat, and on the day ye eat thereof, ye shall surely die,"*[197] *they conceived desire and were infected with it. For one who "desires" does not desire the things that he has, controls and uses, but the*

---

191 2 Cor 12:2.
192 Eph 5:28.
193 1 Thes 5:23.
194 Rom 7:9.
195 Gen 2:7.
196 Rom 7:8.
197 Gen 2:17.

things which are forbidden and barred to him, and which he does not have. (7) *Thus Paul was right to say, "I had not known lust if the Law had not said, Thou shalt not covet"—that is, if "Ye shall not eat thereof," had not been said. This is the way in which sin gained the opportunity and occasion for its entry, to mock me and pervert me.*

56,1 *For once the commandment had been given, the devil got his opportunity to produce covetousness in me through the commandment, and cunningly urged and provoked me to descend to the desire for the forbidden.* (2) *"For without a law sin is dead"*[198]*—that is, there was no way of committing sin when the commandment had not been given and was not yet in existence. "I was" blamelessly "alive"*[199] *before the commandment, because I had no rule and ordinance to live by, from which it would be sinful for me to fall away.* (3) *"But when the commandment came, sin revived and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death,"*[200] *because once God had given a law and specified what should and should not be done, the devil produced covetousness in me.* (4) *For though God's counsel and the commandment he gave me were meant for life and immortality, so that, if I obeyed the commandment and lived by it, I would have an untroubled life of the highest eternal beatitude, flourishing forever in immortality and joy, its result, because I transgressed it, was my death and condemnation.* (5) *For the devil—whom the apostle called "sin" in this instance because he is the artificer and originator of sin—took occasion from the commandment, deceived me into disobedience, and after deceiving me, killed me by bringing me under the sentence of, "In the day that ye eat thereof ye shall surely die."*[201]

56,6 *"Wherefore the law is holy, and God's commandment holy, and just, and good,"*[202] *because it was given, not to harm but to save. Let us not for a moment suppose that God does anything useless or harmful!* (7) *What, then? "Was that which was good"—the commandment I was given to be the cause of my greatest good—"made death unto me? God forbid!"*[203] *God's commandment was not the cause of my enslavement to corruption and the writing of the tablets of destruction. It was the devil, to make it clear that he had made evil ready for me by means of something good, so that the inven-*

198 Rom 7:9.
199 Rom 7:9.
200 Rom 7:10.
201 Gen 2:17.
202 Rom 7:12.
203 Rom 7:13.

tor and architect of sin would become "exceeding sinful"[204] *and be exposed as such, and the < wicked > overseer of the opposite of God's commandment would be distinguished from the good.*

56,8 *"For we know that the law is spiritual,"*[205] *and can thus be the cause of harm to no one; spiritual things have their dwellings far from senseless lust and sin.* (9) *"But I am fleshly, sold under sin."*[206] *That is, since I am fleshly and placed as a free agent between good and evil, so that it is in my power to do what I will—for scripture says, "I have set before thee life and death*[207]*—then, if I have consented to disobey the spiritual law, or commandment, but to obey the material law, or the counsel of the serpent, because of this choice I have fallen under sin and am sold to the devil.*

56,10 *And therefore, after laying siege to me, the evil settles, makes its home and lives in my flesh, like a drone in a beehive which often hovers buzzing around it. For because I broke the commandment, the punishment of being sold to evil was laid on me.* (11) *And thus, when I think of things I want not to do, "I allow not what I do." For "I know not what I do" and "What I hate, that do I"*[208] *are not to be taken of actually doing evil, but of merely thinking of it. For unseemly thoughts often catch us off guard and cause us to imagine things we want not to, since the soul is very much perplexed by thoughts.*

57,1 *For to desire wicked things or not desire them is not entirely our choice, but we can choose whether or not to implement the desires. We cannot prevent the thoughts from occurring to us, since they are insinuated into us from without to test us; but we can refrain from obeying them or putting them into practice.* (2) *How did the apostle do the evil he disliked the most, and least of all do the good he liked—unless he was speaking of the peculiar thoughts which, for some unknown reason, we sometimes entertain even without intending to?* (3) *These must be repelled and silenced, or they will spread and possess the farthest bounds of our souls. For while these linger in us, the good cannot show itself.*

57,4 *The apostle was right, then, to say, "That which I do, I allow not; for what I would, that do I not, but what I hate, that do I."*[209] *We want not even to think of things that are unseemly and infamous, for perfect good is not merely refraining from doing such things, but even from thinking of them.*

---

[204] Rom 7:13.
[205] Rom 7:14.
[206] Rom 7:15.
[207] Deut 30:15.
[208] Rom 7:15.
[209] Rom 7:15; 19.

(5) *And yet this good which we want does not come to fruition; the evil which we do not want, does. Countless < thoughts > on countless subjects haunt our hearts and often enter them even against our will, filling us with curiosity and senseless meddlesomeness.* (6) *And thus we are capable of wanting not to entertain these thoughts, but < not > of banishing them, never to return to our minds. For as I said, we do not have the power to do this, but only the power to comply with the thoughts or not.*

57,7 *Thus the sense of the line, "For the good that I would, I do not,"*[210] *is something like this: "I want not to think of what is harmful to me, since* [*not to do so*] *is irreproachable good, "built foursquare without blemish by hands and heart,'"*[211] *as the saying goes. And "The good that I will, I do not: but the evil that I would not, that do I" means, "I do not want to conceive of them, yet I conceive of the things I want not to."*

57,8 *And < it is worth > asking whether it was for this very reason that David besought God—his own disgust at thinking thoughts he did not choose to—*[*and said*]*, "Cleanse thou me from my secret thoughts, and spare thy servant strange thoughts. If they get not the dominion over me, then shall I be innocent and cleansed of the great sin."*[212] (9) *And the apostle himself says elsewhere, "Casting down thoughts, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of God."*[213]

58,1 *But suppose someone still ventures to speak up and reply that the apostle is teaching that we do the evil we hate and do not want to do, not only by thinking but also by actually doing it—*(2) *since Paul has said, "The good that I would I 'do' not: but the evil which I would not, that 'do' I." I shall require the one who says this to explain, if he is telling the truth, what the evil was that the apostle hated and wanted not to do, but still did—and < what > the good was that he wanted to do but did not do, but on the contrary, as often as he wanted to do this good, he did not do the good he wanted, but the evil he did not want.* (3) *When Paul wanted not to worship idols but to worship God, was he unable to worship God as he wanted to, but able to worship idols as he wanted not to? Or did he not live the sober life he wanted, but a licentious life that was vexatious to him?* (4) *And in a word, did he drink too much, squander his money, grow angry, do injury, and all the rest*

---

210 Rom 7:19.
211 Plato Protagoras 339B.
212 Ps 18:13–14.
213 2 Cor 10:5.

of the evil he wanted not to, but not practice righteousness and holiness as he wanted to?

58,5 *Indeed when, in his effort to see righteousness practiced among us with no admixture of evil, he urgently exhorts all the members of the churches not to transgress, he orders not only that active wrongdoers be reserved for destruction and wrath, but their sympathizers as well.* (6) *In his Epistles he often plainly teaches us to turn our backs on these very things and hate them, and says, "Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor drunkards, nor covetous, nor revilers, nor extortioners shall inherit the kingdom of God."*[214] (7) *And as his last word, to urge us to shun and reject all sin completely, he plainly says, "Be ye imitators of me, as I am of Christ."*[215]

58,8 *Thus the lines we have quoted suggest, not Paul's actual doing of the things he wanted not to, but his mere thinking of them. Otherwise, how could he be an exact imitator of Christ? Since savage thoughts often occur to us, however, filling us time after time with desires and senseless curiosity "like many swarms of buzzing flies,"*[216] *Paul said, "What I would not, that do I."*[217] *One must frighten these things away from the soul with a good courage, and not even incline to the carrying out of their suggestions.*

58,9 *For this troubling of our minds with many thoughts is meant to ensure our admission to the kingdom of heaven after being tested with all sorts of pleasures and pains—provided that we do not change, but like pure gold tried by fire, never depart from the virtue that becomes us.* (10) *We must therefore resist heroically, like shock troops who pay no heed to their arrows and other missiles when they see themselves under siege by enemies, but who eagerly charge them, with zeal unflagging in the defense of their city, till they put their band to flight and drive it beyond their borders.* (11) *For you see how, because of our indwelling sin, these thoughts from without band together against us like mad dogs or fierce, savage bandits, always urged on by the despot and chief of wickedness, who is testing our ability to withstand and resist them.*

59,1 *To work, my soul, or you will yield and be made prisoner, and I will have nothing to give in exchange for you! For "What shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"*[218] (2) *It would be a good thing—indeed, a most*

---

214 1 Cor 6:9–10.
215 1 Cor 11:1.
216 Iliad 2.469.
217 Rom 7:19.
218 Matt 16:28.

happy thing—if we did not have our adversaries and opponents. But as this cannot be—it would amount to salvation without effort—and we cannot have what we want, for we want not to have allurements to passion; and what we want does not materialize, but what we do not want does, since, as I said, we need to be tested; let us never, never yield to the evil one, my soul! (3) *Let us "take the whole armor of God" to protect and fight for us, and "Let us put on the breastplate of righteousness, have our feet shod with the readiness of the Gospel of peace, and above all take the shield of faith, wherewith we shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the evil one, and the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, that we may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil"*[219] *and "cast down thoughts and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God;"*[220] *"for we wrestle not against flesh and blood."*[221]

59,4 *I say this because this is the character of the apostle's writings. There is a great deal to say in proof of the orthodoxy and circumspection even of every line in this Epistle; but to go over each one from this standpoint would take too long. Here I prefer to show simply his character and purpose* (5) *when he says,rightly, "What I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I. < If then I do that which I would not >, I consent unto the law of God that it is good. Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, the good dwelleth not."*[222] (6) *For you remember the limits we set for ourselves earlier. Even though I am going slowly despite my effort to run through everything quickly, although my discourse is more prolix than I had expected it would certainly be desirable to finish it. Besides, we have not yet reached the end of the subject.*

60,1 *Very well, we were saying, if you will recall, that from the moment when the man erred and broke the commandment, sin had its beginning because of his disobedience, and made its abode in him.* (2) *Thus a clash of impulses first fell upon us, and we were filled with unseemly thoughts. Because we had taken a shortcut past God's commandment we were emptied of God's inspiration, but filled with the material desire which the coiling serpent breathed into us.* (3) *And so, for our sakes, God devised death for the destruction of sin, to keep it from being immortal, as I said, since it had appeared in us while we were immortal.*

---

219 Eph 6:13–17.
220 2 Cor 10:4–5.
221 Eph 6:12.
222 Rom 7:15–18.

60,4 *Thus in saying "I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, the good dwelleth not,"*[223] *the apostle means the sin that, since the transgression, has made itself at home in us through desire, the pleasure-loving thoughts of which keep springing up around us like new shoots and twigs.* (5) *For there are two kinds of thoughts in us. The one kind arises from the desire which lurks in the body, and has been caused, as I said, by the inspiration of the material spirit. The other has come from our regard for the commandment, which we have been given to have as an innate natural law, and which urges and restores our thoughts to the good.* (6) *Hence we "delight"*[224] *in the law of God in our minds—this is what the "inner man" means—but with the desire that dwells in the flesh we delight in the devil's law. For the law which "warreth against and opposeth the law of God"*[225]*—that is, opposes our mind's desire, our impulse to the good—is the law which is forever fostering lustful, material turns to lawlessness, and is altogether a temptation to pleasures.*

61,1 *For it seems plain to me that Paul here assumes the existence of three laws. One corresponds to the innate good in us, and he plainly called this the "law of the mind." One arises from the assault of the evil and often draws the soul to sensual imaginings; Paul said that this "law" is at war with the "law of the mind."* (2) *Another is the law which corresponds to the sin that has become habitual in the flesh because of its lust; this, Paul called the "law of sin which dwells in the members." Mounted on this as his steed, the evil one often spurs it against us, driving us to wickedness and evil deeds.* (3) *For the law which is breathed into us from without by the evil one and which, through the senses, pours into the soul itself like a stream of pitch, is strengthened by the law in the flesh which corresponds with its lust.*

61,4 *For it is plain that the better and the worse are within ourselves, and that, when that which is by nature better becomes stronger than that which is worse, the mind as a whole is swayed to the good. But when the worse is larger and weighs us down—the thing which is said to be at war with the good in us—the man, again, is led to all sorts of imaginings and to the worse sort of thoughts.*

62,1 *Because of this very law the apostle prays for rescue; like the prophet who said, "Cleanse thou me from my secret sins,"*[226] *he regards it as death and destruction.* (2) *His words themselves prove as much; he says, "I delight in the law of God after mine inner man, but I see another law in my members,*

---

223 Rom 7:18.
224 Rom 7:22.
225 Cf. Rom 7:23.
226 Ps 18:13.

warring against the law of my mind and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin, which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from this body of death?"[227] (3) *Paul does not term the body "death," but the law of sin in the members < of the body >, which lurks in us because of the transgression and is always inciting the soul's imagination to the "death" of wickedness.*

62,4 *At once, no doubt undone by the sort of death from which he was yearning for rescue, he also adds who his rescuer was: "I thank God through Jesus Christ."*[228] *We must note, Aglaophon, that if, as you people have supposed, he meant that this body is death, he would not be inviting Christ to rescue him later from such an evil. What more peculiar, or even more than peculiar outcome could we have from Christ's coming?*

62,5 *And why ever did the apostle say that he could be freed from this "death" by God through the coming of Christ, when, in fact, death was everyone's lot even before Christ entered the world?* (6) *For everyone was "rescued" from their bodies by being separated from them on their departure from this life. And all the souls likewise—of faithless and faithful, of unjust and just—were separated from their bodies on the day of their death.* (7) *What more than the others—who had lived in unbelief—was the apostle anxious to get? Or if he supposed that the body is the death of the soul, why did he pray for deliverance from the body, which he would surely get even against his will, just as death and the separation of their souls from their bodies is the lot of everyone?*

62,8 *And so, Aglaophon, he does not mean that this body is death, but that the sin which lives < within > the body through lust is death—the sin from which God delivered him by the coming of Christ.* (9) *"For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made us free from the law of sin and death,"*[229] *so that "He that raised up Jesus from the dead may also quicken our mortal bodies because of his Spirit that dwelleth in us,"*[230] (10) *"with the sin in the body condemned" to destruction, "so that the requirement of the law"*[231] *of nature, which attracts us to the good as the commandment directs, may be set alight and made visible. For before Christ's coming when the flesh was controlled by sin, this smoldered feebly under a heap of material cares.* (11) *For God gave new strength to "the impotence of the natural law within*

---

227 Rom 7:22–24.
228 Rom 7:25.
229 Rom 8:2.
230 Rom 8:11.
231 Rom 8:3–4.

us, while it was feeble"[232] *from its defeat by the lust in our bodies. For he sent his Son to take a flesh like our sinful flesh—that which appeared was real, not an illusion—*(12) *so that, with sin condemned to destruction so as to "bring forth" no more "fruit"*[233] *in the flesh, the requirement of the law of nature would be fulfilled. It would have grown, through obedience, in those who followed, not the desire of the flesh, but the desire and guidance of the Spirit.* (13) *For "the law of the Spirit of life," which is the Gospel and is different from the other laws and meant to foster obedience and the forgiveness of sins through the proclamation of it, "hath set us free from the law of sin and death,"*[234] *and entirely conquered the sin which rules the flesh.*

62,14 *I have said these things, Theophilus, to clarify the passages which they cite even from the words of the apostle, but do not expound correctly. But I shall turn to the rest, provided that I can find someone to help me through to the end of my discourse. For the material which follows this is abstruse, and by no means easy to master.* (15) *So I undertake the more difficult part of it, though I can see that the demonstration will be long and hard unless a breeze of understanding suddenly blows on us from heaven as though we were being tossed in mid-sea, and restores us to a calm harbor and a more reliable proof.*

So far the excerpt from Methodius

63,1 This is the < selection* > of consecutive passages < which I have made*> < from > Methodius', or Eubulius', < comments* > on Origen and the heresy which, with sophistical imposture, Origen puts forward in his treatise on resurrection. I believe that my quotation of these passages here will do for his silly teachings, and sufficiently refute his < destruction* > of men's < hope* > for life with a malignancy which has been taken from pagan superstition and plastered over. (2) For many other things—surely even as many more—were also said in his followup of the subject by Methodius, a learned man and a hard fighter for the truth. (3) But since I have promised to say a few things in its refutation about every sect—there are not few of them!—I content myself with quoting Methodius' work [only] this far. (4) And I, of my poverty, shall add a few more comments of my own on Origen's nonsense and conclude the contest with him, awarding the prize to God who gives us the victory and, in his lovingkindness,

232 Cf. Rom 8:3.
233 Cf. Rom 7:4.
234 Rom 8:2.

adorns his church at all times with the unfading wreaths of the teachings of the truth. So, as best I can, I too shall speak against him.

63,5 As I have indicated earlier, Mister, you scornfully say, "Was God a tanner, to make skin tunics for Adam and Eve when no animals had yet been slaughtered? And even if animals had been slaughtered, < there was no tanner there. What the scripture meant, then, was* > not skin tunics, but the body of earth which surrounds us." (6) And you are exposed in every respect as a follower of the devil's < inspiration > and the guile of the serpent, who brought the corruption of unbelief on mankind, deceived Eve, and continues to corrupt the minds of simple people with the villainy < of his inspiration >[235]

63,7 Let's see whether your arguments can stand, then, since you've worked so hard and carried the struggle of writing so many books out to such useless length. (8) For if the story of your composing 6000 books is true,[236] you energy-waster, then, after expending all that futile effort on lampoons and useless tricks and rendering your work valueless and empty, you made the toil of your trafficking profitless by being mistaken in the main points with which you counterfeited the resurrection.

63,9 For if the body does not rise, the soul will have no inheritance either. The fellowship of the body and the soul is one and the same, and they have one work. But faithful men exhaust themselves in body and soul in their hope of the inheritance after resurrection—and you say there will not be one! Our faith is < of no value >, then; and there is no value in our hope, though it is in accordance with the apostolic and true promise of the Holy Spirit.

63,10 But though you, on the contrary, confess a resurrection yourself, since what you have is an illusory appearance and nothing real, you are compelled to say nothing but the name. How can we speak of a soul's "rising," when it doesn't fall and isn't buried? (11) It is plain from the name that the *resurrection* of the body, which has fallen and been buried, is proclaimed, everywhere and in every scripture, by the sons of the truth. But if the body doesn't rise, the resurrection proclaimed by all the scriptures isn't possible. (12) And if there is no resurrection, [any] expectation of the resurrection of the dead is useless. For there is no resurrection of souls, which have not fallen; but there is a resurrection of bodies, which

---

235 Holl τῆς αὐτοῦ ἐπιπνοίας, MSS ἐν ταῖς αὐτῶν διανοίας.

236 Origen's admirer Rufinus attacked Epiphanius for stating publicly that Origen had written 6000 books, and that he, Epiphanius, had read them. Epiphanius denied the charge in a lost letter to Jerome. Cf. Jer. C. Rufin. 2.21–22; 3.23.

have been buried. (13) And even if a portion of the body is raised while a portion is laid to rest, how can there be any such portion? There cannot be parts of the body which are raised, and parts which are laid to rest and left behind.

63,14 < Anyone with a sound mind can see* > that, [just] because there is a spiritual body and an ensouled body, the spiritual body is not one thing and the ensouled body something else; the ensouled and the spiritual body are the same. (15) We have ensouled bodies while we are in the world and doing the corruptible deeds of the flesh; for in the world we are enslaved to the soul in its wicked deeds, as you too have said up to a point. (16) When we are raised, however, there is no more enslavement to the soul but there is a following of the Spirit, for from that time on they have the Earnest[237] as scripture says, "If we live by the Spirit, let us also walk by the Spirit; and if we walk by the Spirit, by mortifying the deeds of the body we shall live."[238] (17) There will be no more marriages, no more lusts, no more struggles for those who profess continence. There will be no more of the transgressions which run counter to purity, and no more of the sorts of deeds that are done here; as the Lord says, "They that are accounted worthy of that resurrection neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels."[239]

64,1 And thus Enoch was translated so as not to see death, and was not found. But at his translation he didn't leave his body, or part of his body, behind. If he had left his body he would have seen death, but being translated with his body, he did not see death. For he is in a living body, and because of his translation his state is spiritual, not ensouled, though, to be sure, he is in a spiritual *body*.

64,2 The same < has been said* > of Elijah, moreover, because he was taken up in a chariot of fire and is still in the flesh—but in a spiritual flesh which will never again need, < as > it did when it was in this world to be fed by ravens, drink from the brook of Kerith, and wear a fleece. It is fed by another, spiritual nourishment the supplier of which is God, who knows secrets and has created things unseen; and it has food which is immortal and pure.

64,3 And you see that the ensouled body is the same as the spiritual body, just as our Lord arose from the dead, not by raising a different body,

---

237 Cf. 2 Cor 5:5.
238 Cf. Gal 5:25; Rom 8:13.
239 Cf. Luke 20:35.

but his own body and not different from his own. But he had changed his own actual body to spiritual fineness and united a spiritual whole, and he entered where doors were barred, (4) as our bodies here cannot because they are gross, and not yet united with spiritual fineness.

64,5 What was it, then, that entered where doors were barred? Something other than the crucified body, or the crucified body itself? Surely, Origen, you cannot fail to admit that it was the crucified body itself! (6) It refutes you by the clear demonstration it gave to Thomas, telling him besides, "Be not faithless, but believing."[240] For Christ displayed even the mark of the nails and the mark of the lance, and left those very wounds in his body even though he had joined his body to a single spiritual oneness. (7) Thus he could have wiped the wounds away too, but to refute you, you madman, he does not. Therefore it was the body which had been buried for the three days in the tomb, and which had arisen with him in the resurrection. For he displayed bones, skin and flesh, as he said, "See that a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have."[241]

64,8 Why, then, did he enter where doors were barred? Why but to prove that the thing they saw was a body, not a spirit—but a spiritual body, not a material one, even though it was accompanied by its soul, Godhead, and entire incarnate humanity. (9) It was the same body, but spiritual; the same body, once gross, now fine; the same body, once crucified, now < brought to life* >; the same body, once conquered, now unconquerable. It was united and commingled with his divine nature and never again to be destroyed, but forever abiding, never again to die. (10) For "Christ is risen from the dead, the firstfruits of them that slept."[242] < But once risen > "He dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him."[243]

65,1 But also, to show you why Christ is called "the firstfruits of them that slept"[244] even though he was not the first to rise—Lazarus and the widow's son arose before him by his aid, and others by the aid of Elijah and Elisha. (2) But since they all died again after rising, Christ is the firstfruits of them that slept. For after his resurrection "He dieth no more,"[245] since, through his life and lovingkindness, he is to be our resurrection.[246]

---

240 John 20:27.
241 Luke 24:39.
242 1 Cor 15:20.
243 Rom 6:9.
244 1 Cor 15:20.
245 Rom 6:9.
246 Holl ἡμῶν μέλλων ἀνάστασις εἶναι, MSS ἡ μέλλουσα ἀνάστασις εἶναι.

65,3 Now if he is the firstfruits of them that slept, and if his body arose in its entirety together with his Godhead, his human nature < must appear in its entirety > after its resurrection with none of it left behind,neither its body nor anything else. "For thou shalt not leave my soul in hades, neither shalt thou give thine holy one to see corruption."[247] (4) And what is said about the soul in hades means that nothing has been left behind; but "holy one" is said to show that the holy body has not seen corruption, but has risen uncorrupted after the three days, forever united with incorruption.

65,5 But Mister, you claim that these bodies are the skin tunics[248] though the passage nowhere says so. But you say it because of the seeds of the Greeks' heathen teaching which were sown in you to from that source, and because of the Greeks' perverse notion which brought you to this and taught you. (6) "For the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit; for they are foolishness unto him, because they are spiritually discerned."[249]

65,7 If Adam and Eve had gotten the tunics before their disobedience, your falsehood would be a plausible one, and deceptive. But since it is plain that < the flesh is already there* > at the time of Eve's fashioning, < how can it not be an easy matter to refute your foolishness?* > What was Eve fashioned from? From a body, plainly; scripture says, "God cast a deep sleep upon Adam and he slept, and God took one of his ribs."[250] (8) But a rib is simply a bone; for God built up "flesh in its place." If flesh is mentioned [at this point], how can its creation still be in prospect?

65,9 And it says earlier, "Let us make man in our image and after our likeness."[251] "And he took dust of the earth," it says, "and fashioned the man."[252] But dust and flesh are nothing else than body. (10) Then later "Adam awoke from his sleep and said, This is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh."[253] (11) The skin tunics were not there yet—and neither was your allegorical falsehood. "Bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh," plainly means that Adam and Eve were bodies, and not bodiless.

---

247 Ps 15:10.
248 Cf. Odes of Solomon 25,6; Iren. Haer. 1.5.5; Hippol. Haer. 10.13.4; Clem. Alex. Exc. Theod. 55.11.
249 1 Cor 2:14.
250 Gen 2:21.
251 Gen 1:26.
252 Gen 2:7.
253 Cf. Gen 2:23.

65,12 And "She took of the tree and ate"[254] when she was seduced by the serpent and fell into disobedience; and Adam heard the voice of God walking in the garden in the evening, and Adam and Eve hid themselves among the trees." And God said to Adam, "Where art thou?" But because he was found out, Adam answered, "I heard thy voice and hid, for I am naked."[255] (13) What did he mean by "naked?" Did he mean the soul or the body? And what did the fig leaves cover, the soul or the body?

65,14 Then God said, "And who told thee that thou art naked, if thou hast not eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee that of it alone thou must not eat?" And Adam said, "The woman whom thou gavest me gave unto me and I did eat."[256] Now where was the woman "given" from if not from the side, that is, from Adam's body—*before* the tunics were given to Adam and Eve!

65,15 And God said to the woman, "What is this that thou hast done?" And she said, "The serpent beguiled me and I did eat, and gave unto my husband also."[257] And God laid the curse on the serpent, the pangs of childbirth on the woman, and the eating of bread by his sweat on the man.

65,16 "And afterwards God said, Behold, Adam hath become as one of us. [And now] lest he put forth his hand and touch the tree of life and live forever."[258] (17) And do not suppose, hearer, that the Lord said, "Behold, Adam hath become as one of us," as a statement of fact. He said it in reproof, to reproach Adam's vanity for being won round by the deceit of the serpent. What Adam had thought would happen, had not happened; that is, Adam had not "become as one of us." From the desire to rise higher, Adam had fallen lower.

65,18 And it was not from envy that God said, "Let us cast him out, lest he put forth his hand to the tree of life, and eat, and live forever," but to make sure that the vessel which had been damaged by its own fault would not always remain damaged. (19) Like a master potter he reduced the vessel with its self-inflicted damage to its raw material, the earth, [to] remold the righteous at the resurrection, completely undamaged, immortal in glory, capable of enjoying the kingdom—and remold the unrighteous at the final resurrection, with the ability to undergo the penalty of

254 Gen 3:6.
255 Gen 3:8–10.
256 Gen 3:11–12.
257 Gen 3:13.
258 Gen 3:22.

damnation. (20) For God planted nothing evil, never think it! He planted just the tree, and by his own decree permitted Adam to take its fruit at the proper time, when he needed it.

65,21 But you will retort, "What becomes of 'In the day in which ye eat thereof ye shall surely die,'[259] if Adam could eat from it? 'Ye shall surely die' would apply to him, surely, no matter when he ate from it!"

65,22 But to the one who says this I reply, "God decreed Adam's death for the transgression he would commit, since, even before giving the commandment, God, < who > knows the future, knew that Adam would be deceived and eat of the tree." (23) Because they are mistaken in this point the sects blaspheme God and say, "Some God of the Law! He envied Adam, cast him out and said, 'Let us cast him out, lest he put forth his hand and take of the tree of life and live forever!' "[260]

65,24 But their stupid idea stands exposed as the false accusation it is. Not only did God not forbid them to eat from the tree of life in the beginning; he even encouraged them by saying, "Of every tree in the garden thou mayest eat for food." But the tree of life too was one of "all the trees in the garden," right before Adam's eyes. (25) Only from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil did God forbid them to eat. But Adam's greedy mind disobeyed the commandment instead, from simplicity and < by listening > to his wife Eve who had been deceived by the devil.

65,26 Since Adam, then, had become defective by his own doing, God did not want him to live forever defective. Like a master potter God chose to change the vessel, which had been spoiled by its own doing, back to its raw material, and again change it from its material, as though on the wheel, at the regeneration, remaking and renewing it with no defects so that it could live forever. (27) Hence at first he threatens death,but the second time he no longer says "death," but says, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return,"[261] "without having consigned the man to death . . ."[262] (28) And after some other material, "And God made tunics of skin and clothed Adam and Eve, and cast them out of the garden."[263] And you see, Origen, that your novel nonsense is worthless. How long Adam and Eve had had bodies!

---

259 Gen 2:17.

260 Epiphanius means the Manichaeans; he quotes this as a Manichaean argument at Pan. 66,83,2. Cf. also NHC Testim. Truth 45,23–47,30.

261 Gen 3:19.

262 A scriptural citation has fallen out before this one.

263 Gen 3:21–23.

66,1 But if this shows your guilt, you unbeliever and worse, and if you cannot receive the grace of the Spirit because of your soulish thinking, then tell me how wonderful and astonishing is each thing that God has done. (2) How has the heaven been spread out from nothing and hung in mid-air? How was the sun made bright, and how were the moon and the stars created? From which primal matter was the earth taken, when it was made from nothing? From which materials were the mountains hewn?

66,3 What was the origin of the whole world, which God brought forth from nothing? How were the clouds formed, which cover the sky in an instant? (4) Where were the gnats and fleas provided from by God's command, for his servant Moses? How did God change Moses' wooden rod into a living serpent that crawled? How was Moses' hand changed to snow? (5) And in Adam's time too, you unbeliever, God willed, and made actual skin tunics without animals, without human craft and any of the various sorts of human work—< and > made them for Adam and Eve at the moment of his willing them, as he willed at the beginning, and the heaven, and all things, were made at that very moment.

66,6 And for those who care < to choose* > life, salvation can be put in a few words and heresy is an easy matter to refute. But for those who are unwilling to receive the doctrine of salvation, not even the whole aeon would not be time enough for discussion, since, as the sacred oracle says, "Their hearing is ever deaf, like the < deaf > adder that stoppeth her ears, refusing to receive the voice of the charmer and the spell cast by the wise."[264] However, although what I say here is not extensive, I believe that it is of no little value to the sons of the truth.

67,1 But I shall pass on to the discussion of resurrection which you base on the first Psalm. For when you deceive the ignorant, you waster of effort, by palming your ideas off on them, and say that some "simple" people believe that the impious do not attain resurrection—and when you show later how you ask these "simple" people which body will be raised, and < mock them by replying* > in your own words for the people you call "simple"—< you are compelled >, for I must say this plainly, to call your so-called "simple" people "good."[265] (2) < For > you are not saying this of yourself, and no grace is being given to your speech; you say it because of the truth, which compels you to give the signs of the superiority and goodness of the servants of God!

---

[264] Ps 57:5–6.
[265] Cf. 64,10,7; 12,5.

67,3 Even the heathen proverb says, "Simple is the speech of the truth." We are accustomed to call the harmless persons, whom the Savior praises at many points, "simple." < For example >, [he says], "Be simple as doves,"[266] and, "Suffer the little children"—that is, the simplest of all—"to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven."[267]

67,4 Now the "simple," as you say, gave you the answer that the resurrection is that of this body in which we are enclosed. And when you raise a difficulty in reply to this and ask them, "Is it a resurrection of the whole body or of a part of it?" they answer, "of the whole body." (5) But when, in your very silly way, you say that this is no good because of the blood that is drained from our bodies, and the flesh, hair, and other things that are voided through our spittle, nostrils and excrement, there is a great deal of trickery in your wrong diagnosis. A better man than I, the venerable and most blessed Methodius, has already countered your fabrication with many arguments.

67,6 But you will also hear a bit from my modest self. Anything we want, we want perfectly clean; we do not require the excess material which is removed from a thing that is clean. (7) Once a garment has been woven on the web it is complete and that is what is cut from the warp, with < nothing > added to it or removed from it. If it is given to a fuller it will not be expected back from the fuller reduced in size; even from the fuller we get it back perfectly whole. (8) Thus it is plain to everyone that it is entirely the same garment, and has become a smaller body in no way but by the removal of the spots and dirt. And surely, since he has removed the dirt, we will not demand the garment back from the fuller dirty; we shall want the garment itself, untorn, in good condition, and perfectly clean.

67,9 But here is another illustration. You have raised the question of the fluid which is drained away by bleedings, illness, excretion, and the dribbling of our spittle and nostrils; but you will be refuted from the very things you have said. (10) For not just this is in the body; vermin—lice and bugs—grow from us, as it were, and are not considered either apart from the body or part of the body. (11) And no one has ever hunted for a bug shed by the body, or a louse bred from the flesh itself, to keep it, but to destroy it. Nor would anyone regard its destruction as a loss. (12) < Just so > we shall not make a foolish search for the fluids we

[266] Matt 10:16.
[267] Matt 19:14.

excrete—though it is often as you say[268]—nor would God return these for our reconstitution. He would leave them behind the second time, like dirt which is the garment's dirt but has been removed from the garment itself for neatness' sake. The creator would plainly return the whole garment by the goodness of his skill, with nothing missing or added; for all things are possible to him.

67,13 But if it were not that way—you, with your brains damaged by your long-winded notion! [If it were not that way], our Savior and Lord, the Son of God, who came to make our salvation entirely sure, and who illustrated our hope mostly in his own person to prove his truthfulness to us, could have discarded part of himself and raised part of himself, you trouble-maker, in keeping with your destructive fiction and accumulation of a host of worthless arguments.

67,14 For to refute your sort of argument, he himself says at once, "Except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it fall and die, it beareth many grains."[269] And whom was he calling a "grain?" (15) It is plain to everyone, and the whole world agrees, that he was speaking of himself—that is, of the body of the holy flesh which he had received from Mary, and of his whole human nature. (16) But he said "fall" and "die" of the three-day sleep of his body itself as he says, "Where the fallen carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together"[270]—and you yourself will admit it. For his Godhead can never sleep, fall, be mastered, or be changed.

67,17 And so the grain of wheat died and rose. Well, did the grain rise whole, or did a remnant of it rise? Did another grain rise in place of the original grain, or did He Who Is himself arise into being? You will surely not deny < that the body* > arose, which Joseph had wrapped in a shroud and laid in a new tomb. (18) Then who did the angels tell the women had risen?—as they say, "Whom seek ye? Jesus of Nazareth? He is risen, he is not here. Come, see the place!"[271] This was as much as to say, "Come, see the place, and let Origen know that there is no question of a remnant's lying here; the body has risen whole." (19) And to show you that it has risen whole, < scripture says > in refutation of your nonsense, "He is risen. He is not here." For no remnant of him was left behind; the very same body < had risen > which had been nailed [to the wood], pierced with the

---

[268] Holl: πολλαχῶς; MSS: οὕτως.
[269] John 12:24.
[270] Matt 24:28.
[271] Matt 28:5–6.

lance, seized by the Pharisees, spat upon. (68,1) And why should I give the multitudes of arguments that demolish this pitiable wretch and the nonsense that has been generated in him? As Christ has risen and has raised his own body, so he will raise us.

68,2 For the holy apostle demonstrated our hope on this basis by saying, "How say some of you that there is no resurrection of the dead? If there is no resurrection of the dead, neither is Christ risen. And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain and your hope is vain. And we are also found false witnesses of God, for we have said that he raised up Christ, whom he raised not up,[272] and so on. (3) And later he adds, "This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality."[273] And he didn't just say "mortal," or just say "corruptible," or, "the immortal soul." He said *"this* corruptible," with the addition of "this;" and "*this* mortal," with the addition of "this." (4) His grain has risen itself, whole. A part of him has not risen; he has risen whole, and not as a grain different than the first. The very grain that fell in the tomb has risen whole.

68,5 And how can your nonsense have any validity? The sacred scripture knows of two "grains," one in the Gospel and one in the Apostle. (6) And the one gives the full explanation because of the process that has been carried to completion in it, which is the pattern of < our > resurrection. For by giving this teaching and putting it into practice, the Savior has surely done everything to prove it to us. (7) No sooner did he speak of the grain than he raised the grain, as a true confirmation of the faith of our hope for our resurrection.

68,8 Here the apostle takes over by the Holy Spirit's inspiration, once more using a grain of wheat to tell us of the saints' glory after the resurrection, and displays their < hope > for the enjoyment of good things. (9) He denounces unbelievers with, "But thou wilt say unto me, How are the dead raised up? With what body do they come?"[274] And to anyone who says such things he replies, "Fool!" For anyone with any doubt of resurrection is a fool and has no understanding. (10) Then he says, "or of other seeds, and it is not quickened except it die. But God giveth it a body as he hath willed, and to every seed its own body. Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die. And that which thou sowest,

[272] 1 Cor 15:12–15.
[273] 1 Cor 15:53.
[274] 1 Cor 15:35.

thou sowest not the body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat or of other seeds, and it is not quickened except it die. But God giveth it a body as he hath willed, and to every seed its own body[275]

68,11 And you see that the body is not changed. No one sows barley and looks for wheat, and no one has sown cummin and gotten barley; the thing that is sown is the same as the thing that is raised. (12) But if—here, in the case of this perishable wheat which is not under judgment—< some > of it is left below in the ground and its shoot comes up, the part that is left behind is of no use, but the thing that comes up from it is better.

68,13 But because of the unbelief of those who do not look for the hope of God, Paul chose to display its splendor. In fact, the grain of wheat is a very tiny thing. Where are the roots, the bottom parts of it, the stems and the joints, in so tiny a grain? Where is such a number of quills, heads, sheaths, ears, and grains multiplying?

69,1 But to put this more clearly by describing things that are like it—how could Moses, the son of Jochabed and Amram, pierce the rock with his staff, bring water from its impenetrable matter, change something dry to something wet? How could he strike the sea, and part it into twelve highways in the sea, by < God's > command? (2) How could he gather so many frogs in an instant? How could he send the lice upon the Egyptians? How could he mingle the hail with fire? How could he make the blackness of a moonless night even darker for the Egyptians? How could he slay the Egyptians' first-born with pestilence?

69,3 How could he lead the people whose shepherd he was with a pillar of fire? How could he bring the bread of angels by prayer and supplication? How could he provide the flock of quails, and glut so many myriads by God's command?

69,4 How could he hear God's voice? Why was he, among so many myriads, privileged to hear God's voice and talk with God? How could he not need the requirements of human nature for forty days and forty nights? How could his flesh be changed to the brightness and shining ray of the sun, making the people so giddy that the children of Israel could not look him in the face? How could his hand, though flesh, be changed to snow? (5) How could he bid the earth open its mouth and swallow Korah, Dathan, Abiram and Onan (sic!)? (6) Why was he told at the end

[275] Cf. 1 Cor 15:36–38.

of his life, "Ascend the mount and die there?"[276] Why does no man know his sepulcher? Holy writ suggests that Moses' body was not buried by men but, as may reasonably be supposed, by holy angels. (7) And all this was while Moses was still in this world and still in this ensouled body—which had, at the same time, become fully spiritual.

69,8 Taking this as the earnest < of our hope, let us use it > as the model of the perfect sprouting then, when "It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power"[277] is fulfilled. (9) For how can something sown without knowing where be anything but "weak?" How can something dumped in a grave and heaped with dust, something torn, decomposed, and without perception, be anything but "dishonored?"

69,10 How can a thing be anything but "honored," when it is raised, abides forever, and obtains a kingdom in heaven by its hope in God's lovingkindness—where "The righteous" shall shine "as the sun;"[278] where they shall be "equal to the angels;"[279] where they shall dance with the bridegroom; where Peter and the apostles "shall sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel;"[280] where the righteous shall receive "what eye hath not seen and ear hath not heard, neither hath entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him?"[281] (11) Our resurrection, then, rests with God, and so does any man's—righteous and unrighteous, unbeliever and believer, some raised to eternal life but some to eternal damnation.

70,1 Quiet, Babel, you ancient confusion who have been brought to life again for us! Quiet, Sodom, and your loud, awful clamor that ascends to God! (2) "For the redeemer shall come from Zion, and turn away iniquities from Jacob,"[282] "The trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall arise,"[283] and "We shall be caught up to meet him in the air"[284] as < my > better, the < venerable and > blessed Methodius, has said, and I myself have added by building on the same words.

---

276 Cf. Deut 32:49–50.
277 1 Cor 15:43.
278 Matt 13:43.
279 Luke 20:36.
280 Matt 19:26.
281 1 Cor 2:9.
282 Isa 59:20.
283 1 Cor 15:52.
284 1 Thes 4:7.

70,3 For from the context of each expression one can see what the wages are. Though the holy apostle distinguished the natures of the two kinds [of saved persons], he united them in one hope with his words, "We shall be caught up in the clouds to meet him"—showing that it is actually this body < that rises > and not something else; for one who is "caught up" has not died. (4) And by indicating that "We shall not precede the resurrection of the dead"[285] as proof that what is impossible for men is easy and possible for God—"For we, the living, shall not precede them that are asleep and their resurrection"[286]—he made it plain that the living are caught up as well. This shows, from the living, that the bodies of the dead will be raised whole; and from the fact that the dead precede those who are alive and remain, it shows what is possible to God. (5) "For the dead shall arise, and they that are in the graves shall be raised up,"[287] says the prophet.

But since I do not want to omit what the prophet Ezekiel says about resurrection in his own apocryphon,[288] I shall give it here. (6) To give a symbolic description of the just judgment in which the soul and the body share, Ezekiel says, *A king had made soldiers of everyone in his kingdom and had no civilians but two, one lame and one blind, and each < of these > lived by himself in his own home.* (7) *When the king gave a marriage feast for his son he invited everyone in his kingdom, but despised the two civilians, the lame man and the blind man. They were annoyed however, and thought of an injury to do the king.*

70,8 *Now the king had a garden. The blind man addressed the lame man from a distance and said, "How much did we have to eat with the crowds who were invited to the celebration? Come on, let's get back at him for what he did to us!"*

"How?" asked the other.

70,9 *And the blind man said "Let's go into the garden and ruin the plants there."*

But the lame man said, "And how can I, when I'm lame and can't [*even*] *crawl?"*

---

285 Cf. 1 Thes 4:15.

286 1 Thes 4:16.

287 Isa 26:19.

288 Epiphanius is the sole authority for this fragment of the Apocryphon of Ezekiel, Fragment 1 in the translation of J. R. Mueller and S. E. Robinson, in Charlesworth I pp. 487–495. Jewish versions of the story are found at T. Sanhedrim 91ab; Mekhilta Exod. 15:1.

And the blind man said, "Can I do anything myself, when I can't see where I'm going? But let's figure something out."

70,10 *The lame man plucked the grass nearby him, braided a rope, threw it at the blind man, and said, "Grab it, and come here to me by the rope." He did as he was told, and when he got there, the lame man said, "Here, you be my feet and carry me, and I'll be your eyes and guide you from on top, to the right and to the left."*

70,11 *By so doing they got into the garden, and whether they did it any damage or not, their tracks were there to be seen in the garden afterwards.* (12) *And the merry-makers who entered the garden on leaving the wedding were surprised to see the tracks in the garden. They told the king and said, "All are soldiers in your kingdom and no one is a civilian. Then why are there civilians' tracks in the garden?"*

70,13 *The king was surprised*—as the parable in the apocryphon says, obviously speaking to men in a riddle. God is not unaware of anything. But the story says, *Tke king sent for the lame man and the blind man and asked the blind man, "Didn't you go into the garden?" but the blind man answered, "Oh, Sir! You see my handicap, you know I can< 't > see where I'm going!"* (14) *Then he went to the lame man and asked him, "Did you go into my garden?" But he replied, "Sir, do you want to make me miserable over my handicap?" And then judgment was stymied.*

70,15 *What did the righteous judge do? Seeing how the two had been put together he put the lame man on the blind man and examined them both under the lash, and they couldn't deny the charge.* (16) *They incriminated each other, the lame man by saying to the blind man, "Didn't you pick me up and carry me?" and the blind man by saying to the lame man, "Weren't you my eyes?"* (17) Thus the body is linked with the soul and the soul with the body, for the exposure of their joint work, and there is a full judgment of both, the soul and the body; < they are jointly responsible* > for the things they have done, whether good or evil.

70,18 And see—you who care for your salvation—how all the attackers of the truth have added to their own wickedness, as the prophet David says, "He hath conceived labor and brought forth wrongdoing."[289] (19) For whoever induces labor with heretical notions within him also gives birth to wickedness, his own and his followers': "He hath digged a cistern and shoveled it out, and shall himself fall into the pit."[290]

---

289 Ps 7:15.
290 Ps 7:16.

70,20 But if anyone can reply to all this, let him come on! If anyone < cares > to oppose God, let him make the venture! For God is mighty and "will not tire, or hunger, or thirst, and there is no finding out of his counsel"[291] by which he raises decayed bodies, saves what is lost, quickens what is dead; by which he clothes the corruptible with incorruption, brings the fallen seed to resurrection, by his renewing of it brings what has been sown and has died to a radiance more glorious. So we find in many scriptures where there are hints of our resurrection.

71,1 In David< 's > Psalm on the rededication of the house of David, the prophet aptly said of resurrection—[speaking] as one who awaited what was to come and saw it by the Holy Spirit's inspiration—"I will exalt thee, O Lord, for thou hast lifted me up and renewed mine house"—that is, the fallen body—"and not made my foes to rejoice over me."[292]

71,2 By holding every part of the hope [of resurrection] ready, Solomon too urged us in riddles to prepare for the next life. He says, "Prepare thy works for their end"—by "end" he means departure from this life—"and make ready for the field."[293] [And yet] he directed the admonition to all alike—countrymen and townsmen, the learned and the artisans, from whom no agricultural labor is expected. (3) Why should linen-weavers, silversmiths, poets and chroniclers prepare to farm? But his cry summoned all together without distinction, and said further, "Make ready for the field." < What > can it be suggesting but that the interment of the body, its end by burial, is a "field" for everyone, townsmen and countrymen alike? (4) And then he says next, meaning the same hope of resurrection, "And thou shalt *rebuild* thine house."[294] He didn't say, "Thou shalt *build* thine house;" it was built once by its formation in the womb, when our mothers conceived us all at our formation. The resurrection will come from the earth, or "field," to a house that is no longer being "built" but, because of its cleansing in the entombed corpse, *rebuilt.*

71,5 And as the Savior said, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise," or build, "it."[295] For he is wisdom, and < excels* > by a "counsel which there is no" human "finding out"[296] By it < he gathers* > our < remains* > from inaccessible places, since some of our bodies have been

---

291 Isa 40:28.
292 Ps 29:2.
293 Prov 24:27.
294 Prov 24:27.
295 John 2:19.
296 Cf. Isa 40:28.

scattered as ashes and some in the sea, while some have been destroyed by birds of prey, wild beasts, or worms—[gathers us] and brings us < whole to regeneration* >. (6) For if God brought the < existent > from non-existence to existence, how much more easily can he restore the existent to the state which is proper to it? In this way he gives a just judgment, and will not judge one in another's place, depriving me of what is mine.

71,7 For if the enjoyment and inheritance of the kingdom of heaven are [only] the soul's, let the body have what it wants! Gideon and his men may live at ease and not be afflicted "in sheepskins and goatskins."[297] John, with his garment of camel's hair, need not labor in vain. Nor need we mortify the flesh in holy retirement, master our bodies through purity. (8) But if the body is the soul's partner in its disciplines, purity, fasting and other virtues, "God is not" [so] "unrighteous"[298] [as] to deprive the laborer of the fruit of his labor, and award no recompense to the body which has labored with the soul.

71,9 [If there is no resurrection of the body], judgment will plainly be suspended. For if the soul appears all by itself it can reply to its sentence, 'The responsibility for the sin is not mine. Fornication, adultery and wantonness are caused by that corruptible body of earth. For I have done none of these things since it left me"—and it will have a good case, and undo God's judgment.

71,10 And even if God should bring the body to judgment by itself—for he can, as I have already shown through Ezekiel[299] For even though the action was set in a parable, that kind of thing was done as an allegory of the truth that was expressed in the [other] parable, when bone was joined to bone and joint to joint and, although the bones were dry and there was no soul or spirit in them yet to move them, the bodies were put together at once, and made firm by the prophet's command. (11) And if God so wills, he has the power to make this body appear and be moved without a soul, as Abel's blood, which is body, not soul, spoke after his death. (For the blood is not soul; anything that can be seen is a body.)

71,12 But the body cannot be judged without a soul. It too could retort, "I didn't sin, the soul did! Since it was separated from me have I committed adultery, fornication, idolatry?" And the body would dispute God's righteous judgment, and with reason. (13) For this and many other

297 Heb 11:37.
298 Heb 6:10.
299 Cf. Pan. 64,70,13 and Ezek 37:4–6.

cogent reasons God in his wisdom brings our dead bodies and our souls to regeneration by his kindly promises, so that one who has grown weary in holiness may receive his whole good reward from God; and those whose deeds were worthless may be judged as well, body with soul and soul with body.

71,14 And as a further assurance of our salvation < the Word himself* > came in the flesh, took perfect manhood and < appeared among us* >, to strengthen his faith within us—foreknowing your future unbelief, Origen, and desiring < to confirm* > the doctrine which you doubt more, and which is doubted in many sects, the Manichaeans and Marcionites whose unbelief is similar to yours. And finally, when he had accomplished everything to confirm and establish his faith and truth in his own person, he did [the same things] for all to see. (15) For after rising from the dead [himself] he raised many bodies of the saints with him, and they entered the holy city with him, as I have also described elsewhere.[300] (16) And to leave no opportunity for an unfair stratagem, the scripture did not say, "the saints arose." It hastened < to confirm* > that very thing which is doubted by unbelievers, and to confirm what we know of salvation said, "the *bodies* of the saints." (17) And it wasn't just that he raised them, but that they showed < themselves > to many in the city when the words, "bringing forth prisoners in manhood"[301]—that is, bringing the souls of the risen bodies—had been fulfilled in them by his power. For these were the prisoners of the camp, who had been confined in hades. (18) And it says, "Likewise them that embitter, the dwellers in graves"[302] to mean the bodies of the risen. And he did not say, "them that have been embittered," or "are embittered," but, "them that embitter."

71,19 For when the newly dead, together with the most ancient, appeared to many in the city—(I presume that he began the resurrection with Adam. And the newly dead < had been buried in the same place, Golgotha, and their bodies laid to rest above Adam's, so that Christ, who* > had been crucified < there, raised*> those buried above Adam on Golgotha < together with Adam* [himself] >, fulfilling the scripture, "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ," who was crucified above thee, "shall give thee light."[303]) [When the recently dead appeared] and other members of their families recognized < them >, at

300 Anc. 100,2; Pan. 46,5,10.
301 Ps 67:7.
302 Ps 67:7.
303 Eph 5:14.

first they astonished the beholders. (20) For if a father met a child who had risen, or a brother met a brother, or a < kinsman > met a kinsman who had died ten or twenty years before, and asked in amazement,"Aren't you so-and-so, whom we buried here? How have you risen and come back?" (21) the newly risen would ask in reply, "What happened here among you three days ago, when the earth was shaken?"

And when the first said, "We arrested a fraud named Jesus who deceived the people and crucified him, and that put a stop to the deception," (22) the risen would at last confess the Lord's grace and truth and say, "Woe to you! You have denied and crucified the Author of the world's salvation! He has raised us by the mighty power of his Godhead and manhood." This at last would provide the fulfillment of the sacred scripture, "likewise them that embitter, the dwellers in the graves." (23) For when they heard from the risen that they had risen through the Lord Jesus, they would feel bitter as death because they had ventured to deny and crucify the Author of life. (24) And perhaps the kindly Lord did even this for the benefit of those who saw the risen. For I presume that many who were pricked in their consciences by seeing the risen, were benefited by it, and became believers. You be converted and believe too, you Origenists, and stop destroying many with your imposture!

72,1 But this will be enough about the would-be sage, Origen, who named himself Adamantius for no good reason, and his outrage against the truth in many points of the faith, the destructive doctrine of his clumsy invention. (2) I shall pass his sect by too, beloved, and investigate the others next, with my usual plea for God's aid to my lack of education, which will enable me to resist and overcome every voice that is raised in vain against the truth, as the holy prophet Isaiah said, (3) "Every voice that is raised against thee, all of them shalt thou overcome, but they shall be guilty."[304] I shall thus carry out my promise in God to those who are willing to read attentively for exercise in truth, and as a medicine, like an antidote, for each wild beast and poisonous snake—I mean these as symbols of the sects—and for this sect of Origenists, which looks like a toad noisy from too much moisture which keeps croaking louder and louder.

72,4 Taking the Lord's resurrection for a preventive draught, as it were, let us spit out the oil of the toad's poison, and the harm that has been done by the noxious creature. (5) For this is what has happened to Origen with all his followers, and I mourn him on this account. Ah, how badly you

[304] Isa 54:17.

have been hurt, and how many others you have hurt—as though you have been bitten by a baneful viper, I mean secular education, and become the cause of others' death.

72,6 Naturalists say that a dormouse hides in its den and bears a number of young at once, as many as five and more, but vipers hunt them. (7) And if a viper finds the den full, since it cannot eat them all it eats its fill of one or two then and there, but punctures the eyes of the rest, and after they are blinded brings them food, and feeds them until it is ready to take each one out and eat it. (8) But if simple people happen upon such creatures and take them for food, they poison themselves with < the > animals that have been fed on the viper's venom. (9) And you too, Origen, with your mind blinded by your Greek education, have spat out venom for your followers, and become poisonous food for them, harming more people with the poison by which you yourself have been harmed.

ANACEPHALAEOSIS V

Here, too, are the contents of the second Section of this same second Volume; in the system of numeration we have indicated, it is the fifth Section. It contains five Sects, as follows:

65 65. < Paulianists, derived > from Paul the Samosatian, who was made bishop of the metropolis of Antioch. He all but insisted that Christ is non-existent, for he portrayed him as an uttered word that has existed only since the time of Mary, and said that what is said about him in the sacred scriptures is predictive—and that he did not preexist, but < came into existence > in Mary's time, through the incarnation.

66,1 66. Manichaeans, also called Acvanites, the disciples of Mani the Persian. They pretendedly speak of Christ but worship the sun and the moon, and invoke stars, powers and daemons. They introduce two first principles, a good one and an evil one, [both of them] eternal. (2) They say that Christ has been manifest [only] in appearance, and that he suffered [only] in appearance. They blaspheme the Old Testament and the God who spoke in it, and declare that not the whole world is God's creation, but [only] part of it

67,1 67. Hieracites, who derive from Hieracas of Leontopolis in Egypt, an expositor of scripture. Although they use the Old and the New Testaments, they deny the resurrection of the flesh. And they entirely forbid marriage, though they accept monks and virgins, and the continent and widows. (2) They say that children who have not reached the age of puberty have no part in the kingdom, since they have not engaged in the struggle.

68 68. Melitians, who live in Egypt and are a schism—though not a sect—because they would not pray with persons who had fallen away during the persecution. Now, however, they have become associated with the Arians.

69,1 69. Arians, also called the Arian Nuts, who say that the Son of God is a creature and that the Holy Spirit is the creature of a creature, and maintain that the Savior took only flesh from Mary and not a soul. (2) Arius was a presbyter of Alexander, the bishop of Alexandria.

This is the summary of the five Sects of the second Section of Volume Two—though counting from the beginning of the series, it is the fifth Section.

Against Paul the Samosatian[1] *45, but 65 of the series*

1,1 Their successor[2] is Paul, called the Samosatian, who was born after Navatus and Origen. (Origen is at last counted as a heretic because of the deliberate arrogance with which he exalted himself against the truth, through his boastful nonsense and the idea of this that was instigated by the devil. (2) He must be mourned as one who has indeed come to grief "through envy of the devil"[3] and fallen from a height; for the saying, "The fascination of evil obscures what is good, and the roving of desire perverteth the innocent mind,"[4] applies exactly to him.)

1,3 Now this Paul the Samosatian whom it has occurred to me to discuss, whose name I mentioned at the start and whose sect I am < now > describing, was from Samosata, which is off towards Mesopotamia and the Euphrates. (4) He was made bishop of the holy catholic church at Antioch at this time, during the reigns of the emperors Aurelian and Probus.[5] But he grew proud and was deprived of the truth, and revived the sect of Artemon[6] who had headed it many years before, but which had been snuffed out.

1,5 Paul claims that God, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit,[7] is one God, but that God's Word and Spirit are always in him, just as a man's own word is in his heart. (6) The Son of God is not an entity but is within God himself—just what Sabellius, Navatus, Noetus and others have said. Still, Paul does not say the same as they, but something different. (7) The Word came, dwelt in Jesus who was a man, < and after doing his work ascended to the Father again* >. (8) And therefore, Paul says, God is one. The Father

---

[1] The most significant ancient accounts are collected at Loofs, *Paulus von Samosata*. Most derive ultimately from the Epistle of the Council of Antioch which deposed Paul in 268, and the Hypomnemata, or minutes of the debate between Paul and the presbyter Malchio which was held at that council. Notable are Eus. H. E. 5.28.1–2; the fifth century monk Leontius' Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos, Appendix to Book III; and the Scholia of Leontius preserved in Theodore, De Spermatis, PG 1213D–1216B. Though Epiphanius has read Eusebius, his information appears to be independent of the Council of Antioch. It may be oral, and represent the sort of thing the Paulianists of his own day were saying.

[2] I.e., the successor of Navatus and Origen.

[3] Wisd Sol 2:24.

[4] Wisd Sol 4:12.

[5] Eusebius mentions Probus' having been made emperor *after* Aurelian, HE. 7.30.22.

[6] Cf. Eus. H. E. 5.28.1. As other authorities say "Artemas," and Eusebius himself says Artemon only here, it is probable that Epiphanius is using Eusebius at this point.

[7] Contrast Loofs p. 85 (Leontius, Scholia), "Paul did not say that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are the same. He said that the Father is God the creator of all, the Son is the mere man, and the Holy Spirit is the grace which was present in the apostles."

is not a father, the Son is not a son, and the Holy Spirit is not a holy spirit, but there is one God, the Father, and his Son in him like a word in a man. (9) Paul supposedly finds his heresy in the following texts: the words of Moses, "The Lord is thy God, the Lord is one."[8] (10) But he does not claim, as Noetus did, that the Father suffered. He says, "The Word came, acted alone,[9] and returned to the Father." And there is a great deal of absurdity in this teaching.

2,1 But let's see whether the deluded man's own words can be proved. For he reminds us that Christ said, "I am in the Father and the Father in me."[10] (2) Now we ourselves say that the divine Word is of the Father, and is with him eternally and begotten of him, but we do not speak of the Father without a subsistent Word. (3) On the contrary, the Father's Word is the only-begotten Son, the divine Word, as he says, "Whosoever shall confess me, him will I confess before my Father."[11] And by saying, "me" before "my Father," he showed that the Father is truly subsistent, < and that the Son is truly subsistent also* >.

2,4 These people, with their covert introduction of Judaism, have nothing more to say than the Jews do. They must be termed neo-Jews, and Samosatians, nothing but an alleged [Christianity] in name < and > supposition. (5) By denying the God [begotten] of God, the only-begotten Son and the Word, they have become like those who denied him when he was here—God's murderers, the murderers of the Lord, and the deniers of God. Actually, however, < they are neither Christians nor Jews* >, since they do not have circumcision or keep the Sabbath, but < hold* > Jewish < views* > on everything else.

3,1 Now we too, in fact, maintain that there are not two Gods or Godheads, but one Godhead. For since we say that there are not two Fathers, two Sons or two Holy Spirits, but a Father, a Son and a Holy Spirit, < we speak of* > one Godhead < and* > one glory. (2) Paul, however, does not call the Father the only God because he is the source [of the Trinity]. When he < says that he > is the only God, he is doing his best to deny the divinity and reality of the Son and the Holy Spirit. He holds instead that the Father is one God who has begotten no Son, (3) so that there are the two Imperfects, a Father and a Son—the Father who has not begotten

[8] Deut 6:4.
[9] Loofs, Holl μόνον, Bardy, Diekamp, MSS μόνος.
[10] John 14:10.
[11] Matt 10:32.

a Son, and the Word of the living God and true Wisdom who is not the fruit[12] [of the Father].

3,4 For they believe that the Word is like the word in a human heart, and the sort of wisdom everyone has in his human soul if God has given him understanding.[13] They therefore say that God, together with his Word, is one Person, just as a man and his word are one. As I said, they believe no more than the Jews do but are blind to the truth, and deaf to the divine word and the message of eternal life.

3,5 For they do not respect the Gospel's true saying, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made through him, and without him was not anything made that was made."[14] (6) For if the Word was in the beginning and the Word was with God, his existence is not just as an utterance but as an entity. And if the Word was *with God*, the One he was with is not the Word—for the One he was with is not a word. For if God [merely] has a word in his heart, and if he does not have a Word he has begotten, how can "was," and "The Word was God," mean anything? (7) A man's word is not a man with a man, for it is neither alive nor subsistent. It is only a movement of a living, subsistent heart,[15] and not an entity. It is spoken, and is at once no longer existent, although it stays said.[16] (8) But < this is not the case with* > God's Word, as the Holy Spirit says by the mouth of the prophet, "Thy word endureth *forever.*"[17] And in agreement with this the evangelist says—confessing that God has been made manifest and come, but not including the Father in the incarnation of the Word—(9) *"The Word* was made flesh and dwelt among us."[18] And he didn't say, 'The Word-and-Father was made flesh." And he also says, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word *was* God"[19]—not, The Word was *in* God."

4,1 And lest people ill-advisedly alter the words of life and light to their own disadvantage and harm, and suppose—"From his youth the heart

---

[12] Conjectural rendering of ἄκαρπον.

[13] Cf. Loofs pp. 77–78 (Leontius Contra Nestorianos), "For wisdom was in the prophets, and more so in Moses, and more so in Christ, as in a temple of God."

[14] John 1:1; 3.

[15] Hübner and MSS ἔχει, καὶ οὐ γεγεννημένον, Holl < προφερόμενον μόνον >Καὶ οἱ . . .

[16] Hübner and MSS λαλούμενος διαμένει, Holl<ἀφανίζεται καὶ οὐ> διαμένει.

[17] Cf. Ps 118:89.

[18] John 1:14.

[19] John 1:1.

of man is bent on the pursuit" of one sort of "evil"[20] or another. (2) Suppose they begin to argue, "As you say yourself, John didn't say, 'The Word was *in* God,' but 'The Word was *with* God.'[21] Therefore the Word is not of the Father's essence but outside of God." [If they say this] the truth turns around to set her sons straight and confound the ideas that are unfaithful to her, (3) and the Only-begotten himself says, "I came forth from the Father and am come[22]—and again, "I am in the Father and the Father in me."[23]

4,4 But for our understanding of the proof, the One < who speaks > of the Son in the prophets stoops to human weakness—not < by > bearing physical burdens but < by > providing understandable words—and < proves > in terms familiar to us that the Son is truly begotten of him, God of God, very God of very God, not outside of him but of his essence. (5) And so he says in David, "Before the morning star have I begotten thee from the womb,"[24] as the Seventy rendered it. And in the words of the other versions—Aquila: "The dew of thy youth is of the womb of the morning"; Symmachus: "As in the dewy dawn is thy youth"; Theodotion: "From the womb, from the dawn of thy youth"; the fifth version: "From the womb, from the dawn is thy dew in thy youth"; the sixth: "From the womb they seek thee, dew of thy vigor."[25] (6) But in the Hebrew it is *merem messaar laktal ieldecheth*,[26] which plainly and unambiguously means, "From the womb before the morning star have I begotten thee." For *merem* is "< from > the womb," and *messaar* means, "before the earliest dawn," or in other words, "before the morning star." *Laktal* is "and before the dew"; *ieldecheth* is "child," or in other words, "I have begotten thee." (7) And so you are to learn from the verse that the subsistent divine Word was actually begotten of the Father, without beginning and not in time, before anything existed.

4,8 For by the star he did not mean just the morning star—though indeed there are many stars and the sun and moon, and they were made on the fourth day of creation. (And the sea, the trees and their fruit had been created earlier—and the firmament and earth and heaven, and

---

[20] Gen 8:21.
[21] John 1:1.
[22] John 16:28.
[23] John 14:10.
[24] Ps 109:3.
[25] This is almost exactly as at Origen, *Hexapla*, ed. Field, Vol. II, p. 266.
[26] Cf. Ps 110:3, Hebrew.

the angels, who were created together with these. (9) For if angels had not been created together with heaven and earth, God would not have told Job, "When the stars were brought forth, all the angels praised me aloud.")[27] (10) And so < he wrote* >, "before the morning star," meaning, "before anything was in existence and had been created." For the Word was always with the Father: "Through him all things were made, and without him was not anything made."[28]

5,1 But someone might say, "You've shown that the angels were before the stars, but you've said they were created together with heaven and earth. Tell us, how have you proved this? Weren't they, surely, created *before* heaven and earth? For scripture nowhere indicates the time of the angels' creation. (2) And that you have shown that they were before the stars, < is perfectly plain >. For if they weren't, how could they sing God's praises for the creation of the stars?

5,3 I cannot give the answer to any question from my own reasonings, but I can from the text of the scriptures. (4) The word of God makes it perfectly clear that the angels were not created after the stars, and that they were not created before heaven and earth; for the statement that there were no creatures before heaven and earth is plainly a firm one. For "God made the heaven and the earth *in the beginning*,"[29] because this is the beginning of < the > creation and < there are > no created things before it.

5,5 And so, as I have indicated, the word in a man cannot be called a man, but a man's word. But if the Word of God is God, it is not a word with no subsistence but a subsistent divine Word, begotten of God without beginning and not in time: (6) for "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of an only-begotten of a Father, full of grace and truth."[30] John testified to him and cried out, "This is he of whom I said unto you, He that cometh after me is preferred before me, for he was before me."[31] "He came into the world, that through him the world might be saved."[32] "He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not."[33]

---

[27] Job 38:7.
[28] John 1:3.
[29] Gen 1:1.
[30] John 1:14.
[31] John 1:15.
[32] Cf. John 3:17.
[33] John 1:10.

5,7 Do you see that the Word is only-begotten? Do you see that he came into the world among men, yet with the full "glory of the only-begotten of a Father?"[34] It is not as though the Father is a Word, or that he has appeared as a Father in combination with a Word, like a man appearing with his word, < where > his word cannot even appear in the absence of the word's speaker.

5,8 Now then, whom should I believe? With whom should I agree? From whose teachings am I to receive life? From the holy, inspired evangelists, who have said that the Word was sent from the Father? Or from these disciples of Paul the Samosatian, who claim that God is combined with the Word and the Word with God, and declare that there is one Person—[the person] of the Father including the Word and the person of the Word including the Father? (9) If there is [only] one Person, how can the one send and the other be sent? For the prophet says, "He shall send forth his Word and melt them; he shall breathe forth his Spirit, and the waters shall flow"[35]—and again, "I came forth from the Father and am come,"[36] and, "I live, and the Father that sent me liveth in me."[37]

5,10 Now how can the One who has been sent be sent, and appear in flesh? "No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten God, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."[38] And he says, "the only-begotten God." The Word is begotten of the Father but the Father was not begotten—hence, "only-begotten God."

6,1 For the safety of our souls the divine knowledge proclaimed its own truth beforehand, because of its precognition. It knew the Samosatian's nonsense, the Arians' heresy, the villainy of the Anomoeans, the fall of the Manichaeans, and the mischief of the rest of the sects. (2) And therefore the divine message makes us certain of every expression. It does not call the Father "only-begotten"; how can One who has never been begotten be "only-begotten?" But it calls the Son "only-begotten," to avoid the supposition that the Son is a Father, and the comparison of the divine Word with a word in a human heart.

6,3 For if he is called a "Word," he is so called for this purpose: to keep it from being supposed that he is different from the essence of God the Father. And because of the expressions, "only-begotten, full of grace and

---

[34] John 1:14.
[35] Ps 147:7.
[36] John 16:28.
[37] Cf. John 6:57.
[38] John 1:18.

truth,"[39] he cannot be a word without subsistence, but must be an entity. (4) And you see how much there is to make our salvation sure. "No man hath seen God at any time" is a statement of the Father's invisibility and Godhead; but < "only-begotten God" >[40] affirms the manifesation of his Godhead through the flesh.

6,5 But how many other texts, and more, might one select in our support and to counter the Samosatian's stupidity? If the Word was in the Father like the word in a human heart, why did he come here and become visible in his own person? (6) To describe himself to his disciples he says, "He that seen me hath seen the Father."[41] And he didn't say, "I am the Father"; "me" means that < he himself is an entity in the Father* >. (7) And he didn't say, "I am he," but, "I am come in my Father's name, and it is he that beareth witness of me."[42]

6,8 And again, he says of the Holy Spirit, "< I will pray the Father > and he shall send you another Advocate."[43] See how < he says >, "he shall send," "another," < and > "I," to show that the Father is an entity, < the Son is an entity >, and the Holy Spirit is an entity. (9) For besides saying, "He shall glorify me," of the Holy Spirit, he [also] < says >, "He shall receive of mine."[44] And what is he talking about? The Spirit who proceeds from the Father and receives of "me."

6,10 Moreover, he says, "Two testimonies of men will be established, and I bear witness of myself, and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me."[45] (11) But how many other texts of the kind, and more than these, < can one find* >? Look here! He says, "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. (12) Even so, Father: for so it seemed good in thy sight. All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son save the Father: neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him."[46] "Thou hast revealed them unto babes" and, "All things are delivered unto me of my Father" are said to uproot the strange doctrine which has been invented by these people.

---

[39] John 1:14.
[40] John 1:18.
[41] John 14:9.
[42] John 5:43; 57.
[43] John 14:16.
[44] John 16:14.
[45] Cf. John 8:17–18.
[46] Matt 11:25–27.

7,1 But see what men's perennial opponent, the devil, has spawned in them, as though by the diabolic inspiration of their speech. (2) For because of the holy Gospels' plain statement of the their teaching, the flunkies of the sect of Jews are ashamed of this and, not to seem entirely at odds with the true knowledge of the Gospel, supposedly defend themselves against these charges. (3) They say, "Jesus was a man, and yet God's Word inspired him from on high,[47] and the man says these things about himself. The Father together with the Son is one God, but the man makes his own person known below, and in this sense there are two persons."[48]

7,4 Now how can a man be God, you stupidest man in the world, with your mind turned away from the heavenly doctrine? How can someone who says, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father,"[49] be a mere man,[50] as you claim? (5) If the man is like the Father, the Father is not different from the man. If, however, the divine Word, who is perfect and has become perfect man, is God begotten of the Father on high, then he is speaking clearly and correctly of himself when he says, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." (6) And the Jews say the same of him. "Not only did they seek to kill him," says the scripture, "because he did these things, but because he said he was the Son of God, claiming equality with God."[51] (7) For once more, in saying, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father,"[52] he is claiming that God the Father is his equal. Now a man is not equal to God or like God; but < the One who > is truly begotten of God the Father is God the only-begotten Son.

7,8 For Paul says of him, "who being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant."[53] (9) < By* > "He was in the form < of God* >," < Paul gave indication of > his Godhead; but as to the form of

---

[47] Cf. Loofs p. 79 (Leontius, Contra Nestorianos), "What does he mean by saying that the constitution of Jesus Christ is different from ours? As we maintain, he differs from us in one way—although it is of the utmost importance—that the divine Word is in him what the inner man is in ourselves . . ."

[48] This is somewhat comparable to Loofs pp. 84–85 (Theodore's Scholion from Leontius), "Paul the Samosatian did not say that the self-subsistent Word had entered into Christ. He said that the word was the bidding and commandment, that is, the Father commanded what he would through that man, and performed it."

[49] John 14:9.

[50] Cf. Loofs p. 64 (Formula Macrostichus of Sardica), "The followers of Paul the Samosatian deny that Christ was God before the ages, and say that later, after the incarnation, deification by promotion came to him who had been a mere man."

[51] Cf. John 5:18.

[52] John 14:9.

[53] Phil 2:6–7.

the servant, he made it clear that this was something added to him, and did not say that this had ever been < native > to him.

7,10 Our Savior and Lord Jesus Christ, the divine Word, often communicates with us even in a human way, and frequently speaks in terms of human experience, (11)[54] but not when he says, "I came forth from my Father and am come";[55] this cannot be the utterance of human nature. (12) When, however, he rightly testifies, "If I bear record of myself my record is not true,"[56] this is meant to show his humanity. When, on the other hand, he testifies of his Godhead, Though I bear record of myself, yet my record is true,"[57] this is to show that his divine nature is true divine nature, and his human nature true human nature.

8,1 And so there are not two Gods, because there are not two Fathers. And the subsistence of the Word is not eliminated, since there is not one [mere] combination of the Son's Godhead with the Father. For the Son is not of an essence different from the Father, but of the same essence as the Father. He cannot be of an essence different from his Begetter's or of the identical essence; he is *of the same essence* as the Father.[58]

8,2 Nor, again, do we say that he is not the same in essence as the Father; the Son is the same as the Father in Godhead and essence. And he is not of another sort than the Father, nor of a different subsistence; he is truly the Father's Son in essence, subsistence and truth. (3) But the Father is not the Son; and the Son is not the Father, but truly a Son begotten of a Father. Thus there are not two Gods, two Sons, or two Holy Spirits; the Trinity is one Godhead, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and co-essential. (4) For when you say, "of the same essence," < you > do not mean an identification. "Co-essential" does not indicate one [single] thing; neither does it differentiate the true Son's essence from his lawful Father's and, because of the co-essentiality, distinguish his nature [from the Father's].

8,5 For sacred scripture does not proclaim two first principles, but one; it says, 'The house of Judah shall join with the house of Israel, and they shall agree upon one first principle" (ἀρχήν)[59] Therefore whoever preaches two first principles, preaches two Gods; and whoever denies the Word and his subsistence reveals his Judaism. (6) Marcion intimates that

---

54 This is paragraph 12 in Holl's numbering, which omits paragraph 11.
55 John 16:28.
56 Cf. John 8:13.
57 John 8:14.
58 ἑτεροούσιος, ταυτοούσιος, ὁμοούσιος.
59 Hos 2:2.

there are two first principles—or rather, three—in opposition to each other. But these neo-Jews, these Samosatians, do away with the subsistence of the Word, showing that they too are murderers of the Lord and deniers of our Lord's salvation.

8,7 Thus there is one first principle and the Son [begotten] of it—its exact image, by nature the replica of his Father, and like him in every way. For he is God of God and the Son of the Father, very God of very God and light of light, one Godhead and one dignity. (8) Thus scripture says, "Let us make man in *our* image and after *our* likeness."[60] So as not to divide it does not say, "in thine image"; so as not to imply unlikeness and inequality it does not say, "in my image"; it says, "in *our* image." And "let us make" is said to show that the Father is not strange to his creatures, nor the Only-begotten strange to creation. (9) The Father creates with the Son, and the Son, through whom all things were made, is co-creator with the Father. And since the Son is begotten of the Father there is one Son, the perfect Son of a perfect Father; and there is a perfect Father of a perfect Son, who is in the image of his Father's perfection. [He is] "the image of the invisible God"[61]—not the model of an image, not the image of an image, not unlike the Father, but the Father's image, showing the exact likeness [to the Father] of his true generation from him who has no beginning and is not in time.

8,10 Thus the Son is the image of the Father. It is the same with emperors. Because the emperor has an image there are not two emperors; there is one emperor, with his image. [And] there is one God. He is not one imperfect thing, made of two parts; the Father is perfect, the Son is perfect, the Holy Spirit is perfect. (11) For < the Son does > not < say >, "I am in the Father,"[62] as a word is in a man's heart; we know a knowing Father with a Son, and a Son begotten of a Father. (12) The divine message < does > not < declare > that a Word entered a man for a dwelling, appeared in him after his birth, and is on high in God once more, like a word in a human heart. This is the product of demon's madness and bears the marks of all denial of God.

9,1 < I come to a close* > because I believe that these few remarks which I have made about this sect will do. Their power is not formidable, or such that it cannot be overcome by all wise persons. (2) And we have

[60] Gen 1:26.
[61] Col 1:15.
[62] Cf. John 10:38.

now uprooted Paul's thorns by preaching the doctrine of the truth, have, as it were, quenched his poison, and pointed out the deadliness of it. Calling for aid on the Father with the Son—on the truly existent God and the truly subsistent Son he has begotten, and on his Holy Spirit, who subsists as a Spirit—(3) and < arming ourselves* > with the salvation of the work of the incarnate Christ, we have broken the van of this assault of the neo-Jews with the sign of our victory over death, I mean the cross. Let us go on to the rest, beloved.

9,4 For there is a viper called the dryinas which is like this heresiarch. It is said that a dryinas is a viper, and that its den is very often near grass or, also, oaks. This is why it is called a dryinas—from its preference for trees, and its camouflaging of itself among the fallen leaves with the color of each leaf. (5) The beast does not have a particularly painful bite, but if it remains [undetected] it causes death. (6) In the same way this man, with his sect, pretends to belong to the faithful by bearing Christ's name while adopting Jewish doctrine. He confesses that Christ is the Word but does not believe that he is; and he is not ashamed to make a parade of himself in many ways.[63] (7) But now that we have trampled his seeming doctrine, which is actually imposture, with the sandal of Christ, and have scratched the victims of his bites with the healing scalpel of the Gospel and drawn the poison out of them, we shall go on to describe the rest, beloved, as I said.

Against Manichaeans.[1] *46, but 66 of the series*

1,1 The Manichaeans < are > also called Acvanites after a veteran from Mesopotamia named Acvas[2] who practiced the profession of the pernicious Mani at Eleutheropolis. (2) They began to preach to the world at that time, and brought a great evil on the world after the < sect > of Sabellius.

---

[63] Paul's ostentatious behavior is described at Eus. H. E. 7.30.8–11; Epiphanius may be alluding to this passage. See also the Epistle of the Council of Antioch, 268 AD, translated at Loofs pp. 4–9.

[1] Epiphanius' chief literary source for this sect is the Acta disputationis Archelai cum Manete. At 23,3 he mentions eight other anti-Manichaean works, of which he has very likely used Titus of Bostra's Contra Manichaeum and possibly some others. 12,4, 21,4 and especially 36,4 show that he and his acquaintances had personal contact with Manichaeans.

[2] For Zaco, one of Mani's early disciples who died about 301 AD., see Asmussen p. 106 (M 6, Parthian: MM III pp. 865–867) and pp. 31–32 (M 6, Parthian, MM III pp. 865–867, Cat. p. 2); Fihrist al-'Ulum at Flügel, Mani p. 104. However, Acvas might simply have been a local Manichean missionary at Eleutheropolis.

For they arose in the time of the emperor Aurelian, about the fourth year of his reign[3] (3) This sect is widely reported and is talked of in many parts of the world, and as I said, owes its worldwide spread to a man named Mani.

1,4 Mani was from Persia, and was originally named Cubricus. But he changed his name to Mani (Μάνη)[4] to call himself mad, I suspect by God's providence. (5) And as he thought, he was calling himself "vessel," in Babylonian[5] if you please; "vessel" (μάνη) translated from Babylonian to Greek, suggests the name. But as the truth shows, he was named for the madness which caused the wretch to propagate his heresy in the world.

1,6 Cubricus was the slave of a widow who had died childless and left him an incalculable wealth of gold, silver, spices and other goods. (7) She herself had inherited the property from a Terbinthus who had also been a slave, whose name had been changed to "Buddha,"[6] in Assyrian. And Terbinthus himself had been the slave of a Scythianus,[7] who was a Saracen but had been brought up on the borders of Palestine, that is, in Arabia.

1,8 Scythianus had been taught the language and literature of the Greeks there, and had become proficient in their futile worldly doctrines. (9) But he made continual business trips to India, and did a great deal of trading. And so he acquired worldly goods[8] and as he traveled through the Thebaid[9]—there are various harbors on the Red Sea, (10) at the different gateways to the Roman realm. One of these is at Aelan—Aelon in sacred

---

[3] Epiphanius' information comes from Eusebius by way of Jerome's Chronicle, 223,25. Jerome dates Mani from the time of "Aurelian and Probus," as do Act. Arch. 31,8; Cyr. Cat. 6.20, and Epiphanius himself at 19,9; 20,3, 78,1.

[4] Cf. Act. Arch. 62–64; Cyr. Cat. 6.20–24. The scurrilous biography of Mani which follows would have been an attempt to combat the Manichaean deification of him. Contrast Klimkeit p. 163 (*A Bema Liturgy*, Persian and Parthian) "We would praise the God, Mani, the Lord! We honor thy great, bright glory, we bow down before thy Holy Spirit," with Cyr. Cat. 6.6, which asks if anyone would wish to worship such a disreputable person, and Mani's life as described in CMC.

[5] Mani describes himself as "a man of Babylon" at Asmussen pp. 8–9 (M 4,2 V, Parthian: *HR* II, pp. 51–52); M 566 I, Parthian: *HR* II, p. 87.

[6] Cf. Act. Arch. 63.2; Cyr. Cat. 6.23. "Buddha" is named with Zoroaster and Jesus as one of the three apostles who preceded Mani, Keph. 7,34; 12,15 et al.

[7] Cf. Act Arch. 62.2–7; Cyr. Cat. 6.22.

[8] Manichaean writings often use the metaphor of a merchant with a wealth of goods. E.g., Keph. 11,18–20, "like a merchant who comes from [a country] with the doubling of his large cargo and the wealth of his goods."

[9] With Holl, Drexl we leave the clause before the parenthesis incomplete. Oehler, Dummer punctuate after αὐτόν, giving better grammar but a rather un-Epiphanian sentence.

scripture. It was perhaps there that Solomon's ship arrived every three years, bringing gold, elephant's tusks, spices, peacocks and the rest. (11) Another harbor is at Castrum in Clysma, and another is the northernmost, at a place called Bernice. Goods are brought to the Thebaid by way of this port called Bernice, and the various kinds of merchandise from India are either distributed there in the Thebaid or to Alexandria by way of the river Chrysorroes—I mean the Nile, which is called Gihon in the scriptures—and to all of Egypt as far as Pelusium. (12) And this is how merchants from India who reach the other lands by sea make trading voyages to the Roman Empire.

2,1 I have been at pains to convey this in full detail for your information, so that those who care to read this will not go uninformed even of the remote causes of every affair. For whoever embarks on a narrative must start it the best way he can, and introduce it from the very beginning. This is how the truth comes to light too, (2) and even though the speaker has no command of polished speech and elegant language the wise will still be told what they should be by the truthful account.

2,3 To begin with, then, Scythianus was puffed up by his great wealth, and his possessions of spices and other goods from India. (4) And in traveling over the Thebaid to a town called Hypsele, he found a woman there who was extremely depraved though of evident beauty, and made a deep impression on his stupidity. Taking her from the brothel—she was a prostitute—he grew fond of the woman and set her free, and she became his wife.[10] (5) After a long while, because of the extreme luxury in his possession, nothing would do the sinner but that, like an idle person accustomed to evil by the extreme wantonness of his luxury, he must finally think of something new, in keeping with his taste, to offer the world. (6) And out of his own head he made up some such words as these—for he did not take them from the sacred scripture and the utterance of the Holy Spirit, but said, on the basis of wretched human reasoning, (7) "What is the reason for the inequalities[11] throughout the visible vault of creation—black and white, flushed and pale, wet and dry, heaven and earth, night and day, soul and body, good and evil, righteous and unrighteous—unless, surely, these

[10] Cf. Act. Arch. 62.4. The story comes from the heresiologists' account of Simon Magus, cf. Iren. 1.23.2; Epiph. Pan 21,22 et al.

[11] Klimkeit pp. 273–274 (Uighur Chuashtuanift): "If we . . . should have called him the origin and root of Light as well as Darkness, and of God as well as the Devil; If we should have said, 'If anybody quickens, it is God that quickens; if anybody slays, it is God that slays . . .' "

things originate from two roots, or two principles?"[12] (8) But to employ him for further warfare against the human race, the devil spawned the horrid supposition in his mind that non-being does not know being.[13] This was meant to start a war in the minds of the dupes who believe that there is something more than Him Who Is, and that all things are products of two roots,[14] as it were, or two principles. This [last] is the most impious and unsound idea of all.

2,9 But I shall speak of this another time. Scythianus, whose mind was blind about these things, took his cue from Pythagoras[15] and held such beliefs, and composed four books of his own.[16] He called one the Book of the Mysteries[17] the second the Book of the Summaries,[18] the third the Gospel[19] and the fourth the Treasury.[20](10) In them he contrasted and < exhibited* > the personae, in every respect perfectly balanced and evenly matched, < of the > two principles. Pathetically he supposed and imagined that he had made a great discovery about this. And he had indeed discovered a great evil, for himself and the people he misleads.

3,1 Scythianus was busy with this, but had heard how the prophets and the Law spoke prophetically of the creation of the world, of the one, sovereign, everlasting Father who will have no end, and of his Son and the Holy Spirit. (2) Since he lived in greater luxury [than they], made fun of them in his boorish mind, and was egged on by the haughty arrogance within him he chose to travel to Jerusalem,[21] about the apostles' time, (3) and dispute there, if you please, with the preachers of < God's > sovereignty and the [creation of] God's creatures.

3,4 On his arrival the unfortunate man began to challenge the elders there—who were living by the legislation which God had given to Moses and < confirmed* > by the inspired teaching of every prophet—(5) with,

---

12 Cf. CMC 132,11–13, "I showed them the distinction between the two natures."

13 Cf. Tit. Bost. Man. 1.17, "That very writing from which we have produced the doctrines of Manes says that (the powers of darkness) neither knew that God was living in the light . . ."

14 Cf. Keph. 35.34, "(The first Father) is the root of all the lights."

15 Scythianus' teachings are identified as Pythagorean at Act. Arch. 62.3.

16 Keph. 5,22–25, "I have written in my books of light; in the Great Gospel and the Treasury of Life, and the Pragmateia and the Book of the Mysteries, the scripture I have written for the Parthians, as well as all the Epistles, and the 'Psalms and Praises.' " And cf. Act. Arch. 62.3; Cyr Cat 6.22.

17 This is called "Mysteries of Wisdom" at Man. Hom. 43.17.

18 The Kephalaia, rediscovered by Carl Schmidt in 1929.

19 CMC 66,4–70,9 are a long excerpt from the Gospel.

20 This is called the Treasury of Life at Keph. 230,20–22.

21 Act. Arch. 62.7; Cyr. Cat 6.22.

"How can you say that God is one, if he made night and day, flesh and soul, dry and wet, heaven and earth, darkness and light?"[22] (6) They gave him a plain explanation—the truth is no secret—but he was not ashamed to contradict them. And though he could not achieve his aim, he still behaved with stubborn shamelessness.

3,7 But since he met with no success but was worsted instead, he produced an illusion with the magic books he owned. (He was a sorcerer too, and had obtained the horrid, pernicious arts of magic from the heathen wisdom of the Indians and Egyptians.) (8) < For > he went up on a housetop and conjured,[23] but still achieved nothing—instead he fell off the roof and ended his life.[24] He had lived in Jerusalem for some years.

3,9 He had had just one disciple with him,[25] the Terbinthus we mentioned earlier. He had entrusted his possessions to this disciple, as to a very faithful servant who obeyed him with a good will. (10) When Scythianus died Terbinthus buried him with all kindness but once he had buried him planned not to return to the woman, the former harlot or captive who had been married to Scythianus. Instead he took all the property, the gold, the silver and the rest, (11) and fled to Persia. And to escape detection he changed his name as I have said, and called himself Buddha[26] instead of Terbinthus.

3,12 For his evil inheritance he in his turn obtained Scythianus' four books and his implements of magic and conjuring—for he too was very well educated. (13) In Persia he lodged with an elderly widow and in his turn debated about the two principles with the attendants and priests of the idol of Mithra, with a prophet named Parcus, and with Labdacus, but < accomplished nothing* >. Since he could not even dispute with the promoters of idolatry but was refuted by them and disgraced, (14) he went up on the housetop with the same intention as Scythianus—to work magic, if you please, so that no one could answer his arguments. But he was pulled

[22] Cf. Keph. 267,13–18, "All ugly evils and defilements, archons and demons, witches and Satans have said that they come from God and that it is he who made them . . . they do not come from him, and they are bearing false witness against him."

[23] At CMC 138,9–13 one of Mani's opponents, the head of a synagogue, attempts to cast spells against Mani.

[24] Like Scythianus' marriage, this detail is influenced by the Christian account of Simon Magus. Cf. Epiph. Pan. 21,5,2.

[25] Act. Arch. 63.4, "no disciple having joined him except an old woman".

[26] Act. Arch. 63.1–2; Cyr. Cat. 6.22.

down by an angel and fell, and so died from the same magic that he had intended to work.[27]

3,15 The old woman saw to his burial, and came into possession of his property. Having no children or relatives, she remained alone for a long while. (16) But later she purchased Cubricus, or Mani, to wait on her. And when she died[28] she left the evil inheritance to him, like poison left by an asp, for the ruin and destruction of many.

4,1 In his turn Cubricus, who had taken the name Mani, lived in the same place and conducted discussions there. And no one believed him; everyone who heard Mani's teaching was annoyed, and rejected it for its novelty, shocking stories, and empty imposture.[29](2) Seeing the defeat of his own mischievous formularies, the feather-brain looked for some way of proving the truth of this dreadful fabrication of his.[30]

4,3 It was rumored that the son of the king of Persia had fallen victim to some disease and was confined to his bed in the capital city of Persia—Mani did not live there, but in another place, a long way from the capital. (4) Blinded by his own wickedness, and thinking that he might be able to perform cures on the king's son from the books he had acquired of Scythianus' successor, his own master Terbinthus or Buddha, Mani left his place of residence and ventured to introduce himself, claiming that he could be of service.[31]

4,5 But though he administered various drugs to the king's ailing child, his expectation was disappointed. The boy finally died under his ministrations, to the confusion of all empty claims falsely made.[32] (6) After this outcome, Mani was imprisoned by royal decree.[33] (7) (The kings of Persia do not execute persons guilty of major crimes at once; they find ways

---

[27] Act. Arch. 63.4–6.

[28] Act. Arch. 63.1–4; Cyr. Cat. 6.24.

[29] CMC 87,6–90,7 chronicles sharp hostility to Mani's teachings on the part of the "baptists" with whom he broke. Keph. 186,25–187,25 tells of a series of rejections of Mani in various lands.

[30] At CMC 36,13–21 Mani prays, "[And] further, that the church may grow, I [beg of thee all the] power of [the signs], that I may perform [them] by my hands, [in] every [place, and all villages] and towns."

[31] At CMC 121,11–123,13 Mani heals a sick girl. Cf. Asmussen p. 9 (M 566 I, Parthian: *HR* II, p. 87) where he performs what appears to be the same healing before the king of Persia.

[32] At Asmussen p. 54 (M 3, Middle Persian, W. B. Henning, "Mani's Last Journey," BSOAS 10, 1942, pp. 949–952) Bahram I accuses Mani, "But perhaps you are needed for this doctoring and this physicking? And you don't even do that!"

[33] At Man. Hom. 48,19–25 Mani is loaded with chains and threatened. Man. Ps. 18,30–19,26 says that the imprisonment lasted 26 days.

of inflicting a further sentence of death, by torture, on those who are [already] faced with that threat.)[34] And so much for that.

5,1 Thus Mani, or Cubricus, remained < in > confinement, visited by his own disciples. (2) For by now the scum had gathered a band, as it were, already about twenty-two,[35] whom he called disciples. (3) He chose three[36] of these, one named Thomas,[37] and Hermeias, and Addas,[38] with the intention < of sending them to Judaea* >.[39] For he had heard of the sacred books to be found in Judaea and the world over—I mean < the > Christian books, the Law and Prophets, the Gospels, and the Apostles.

5,4 Giving his disciples money, he sent them to Jerusalem. (5) (But he had done this before his imprisonment, when he found himself unable to sustain his doctrine in discussion with many. (6) Having heard of the name of Christ, and of his disciples, I mean the Christians, he had determined to deceive his dupes with the name of the Christian religion.)

5,7 They went off and purchased the books, for they made no delay. But when, on their return, they found Mani no longer at liberty but in the prison, they entered even that and showed him the books. (8) He took and examined them, and fraudulently combined his own falsehood with the truth wherever he found the form of a word, or a name, which could show a resemblance to this doctrine. In this way he finally provided confirmation for the sham of his sect.

5,9 In the meantime, however, he escaped by importuning his jailer and bribing him heavily,[40] and he left Persia, and arrived at the Roman realm. (10) But when he reached the border between Mesopotamia and Persia[41] and was still in the desert, he heard of an eminent man named Marcellus[42] who was famous for piety of the finest sort and lived in the

---

[34] At CMC 100,1–12 Mani is beaten, though by the "baptists" rather than the king.

[35] Act. Arch. 64.4 mentions only the three named at Pan. 66,5,3; Aug. Haer. 46.8 gives Mani twelve disciples. The number 22 may come from Act. Arch. 14.2, where Mani brings 22 disciples to Marcellus' home.

[36] CMC 106,7–23 gives Mani three original disciples, named Simeon, Abizachaeus and Patticius. Cf. Cyr. Cat. 6.31.

[37] A division of the Manichaean Psalms, Allberry pp. 203–227, are the "Psalms of Thomas."

[38] Man. Ps. 235,13–14, (Allberry p. 34) "Glory to Addas, our [Lord]"; cf. CMC 165,6.

[39] Act. Arch. 65.2–4; but there Mani sends for the books from prison.

[40] Cf. Act. Arch. 65.7, where Mani escapes in obedience to a dream; Cyr. Cat. 6.26–27 mentions his escape without giving details.

[41] At CMC 140,11–14 Mani and Patticius come to Pharat; CMC 144,4 says, "a town in Pharat named Og[?]."

[42] Act. Arch. 1.1–3; 3.5–7. Cf. CMC 144,4, "In Pharat (in the town?) named Og, (there was) a man famous for his [power] and authority."

Mesopotamian city of Caschar.[43] Marcellus was a thoroughgoing Christian and remarkable for his righteous works, and supplied the needs of widows, the poor, orphans and the destitute.

5,11 It was Mani's intent to attach himself to Marcellus, to gain control of him and be able not only to rule Mesopotamia through him, but the whole region adjacent to Syria and the Roman Empire. (12) But he sent him a letter[44] from the boundary of the river Stranga, from a place called Fort Arabio, by Turbo, one of his disciples, and this is what it said. Read it, and have a look at the instrument of the fraud's wickedness![45]

6,1 *Mani, an apostle of Jesus Christ,*[46] *and all the saints and virgins who are with me, to my beloved son, Marcellus: Grace, mercy, peace from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ. And the Light's right hand preserve you from the present evil age and its mischances, and the snares of the evil one. Amen.*

6,2 *I am overjoyed to hear that your love is very great, but grieved that your faith is not in accord with the right reason.* (3) *I therefore feel impelled to send you this letter, since I am sent for the correction of the human race, and care for those who have given themselves over to imposture and error.* (4) *[I write], first for the salvation of your own soul, and then for the salvation of those who are with you, so that you may not have an undiscerning mind, as the guides of the simple teach, who say that good and evil are brought by the same [God], and introduce a single first principle.* (5) *As I have said, they neither distinguish nor differentiate darkness from light, good from wicked and evil,*[47] *and the outer man from the inner, but never cease to confuse and confound the one with the other.*

6,6 *But do you, my son, not combine the two as most men do, absurdly and foolishly in any chance way, and ascribe them both to the God of goodness.*[48] *For those "whose end is nigh unto cursing"*[49] *trace the beginning, end and*

---

[43] Kaskar (variously spelled) is sometimes called a city by the Arab geographers, and sometimes a district. It was under Persian, not Roman rule. See Flügel, *Mani*, pp. 20–25.

[44] An Epistle to Kaskar is mentioned in a list of Manichaean Epistles, Fihrist al-'Ulum, Flügel, p. 103, Item 6.

[45] This letter is quoted from Act. Arch. 5.

[46] At CMC 66,4–7 Mani begins his Gospel, "I Manichaeus, apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of Cod the Father of truth from whom I spring." "Apostle" is his regular title in Manichaean literature.

[47] Keph. 191,1–3, "He shall believe, and call on him and the physician whom I have brought, and distinguish light from darkness, good from evil."

[48] Cf. Man. Ps. 248,3–6, (Allberry p. 57) "If it was God who created the evil and the good and Christ and Satan . . . then who sent Jesus, that he might work among the Jews until they slew him?"

[49] Cf. Heb. 6:8.

father of these evils to God. (7) *Neither do they believe what is said in the Gospels by our Savior and Lord Jesus Christ himself, "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, nor, assuredly, can an evil tree bring forth good fruit."* [50] (8) *And how they dare to say that God is the maker and artificer of Satan and his ills, is amazing to me.*

6,9 *And would that their vain effort stopped with this, and they did not say that the Only-begotten, the Christ who has descended from the bosom of the Father, was the son of a woman, Mary, born of blood and flesh and women's ill-smelling effluent!* [51] (10) *And since I have no native eloquence I shall rest content with this, not to abuse your forbearance by writing at length, for a considerable time, in this letter.* (11) *You shall know the whole when I come to you—if, indeed, you are still tender of your salvation. For I put a noose on no one, in the manner of the senseless [teachers] of the multitude. "Mark what I say,"* [52] *most honored son!*

7,1 The most distinguished, godfearing and eminent Marcellus was surprised and shocked when he read this letter. For as it happened, the bishop of the town, Archelaus, was in his home with him the day the servant of God received Mani's letter. (2) When Archelaus found what the matter was and had read the letter, he gnashed his teeth like a roaring lion and with godly zeal made as to rush off to where Mani was and arrest him for a foreigner come from the barbarians, from whom he was hastening to destroy the human race.

7,3 But Marcellus in his wisdom begged the bishop to calm down, but told Turbo to terminate his [return] journey to Mani, [who was] at Fort Arabio, where he would be awaiting Turbo. (This fortress is on the border between Persia and Mesopotamia.) (4) Marcellus declined to go to Mani, and not to compel Turbo to do so sent one of his own runners, and wrote Mani the following letter.

---

[50] Matt 7:18. At Keph. 17,2–9 this text is used to introduce the teaching of the two contrasting realms, though the verse quoted there is Luke 6:43–44. Cf. Act. Arch. 15.6; Aug. Adim. 26; Fel. 2.2; Theodoret Haer. Fab. 1.26.

[51] Man. Ps. 254,23–26, (Allberry p. 52) "He was not born in a womb corrupted; not even the mighty were counted worthy of him for him to dwell beneath their roof, that he should be confined in a womb of a woman of low degree."

[52] 2 Tim 2:7.

Marcellus' Letter to Mani [53]

7,5 *Greetings from the distinguished personage, Marcellus, to Manichaeus, who is made known by the letter. I have accepted the letter you have written, and of my kindness extended hospitality to Turbo. But I have no way of understanding the sense of your letter unless you come, as you promise in your letter, and explain each point in detail. Farewell.*

8,1 When Mani learned of this he thought that the absence of the detained Turbo boded no good. (To confirm his own notion, Mani often deceived even himself by drawing wrong conclusions). All the same, he took the letter as an occasion for hurrying to Marcellus.

8,2 Now as well as being intelligent the bishop Archelaus had a zeal for the faith. His advice was to have Mani executed at once, if possible—as though he had trapped a leopard or wolf, or some other wild beast—so that the flock would not be harmed by the onslaught of such a predator. (3) But Marcellus asked for the < exercise > of patience, and that there be a restrained discussion between Archelaus and Mani. (4) Archelaus, however, < had > by now learned the whole essence of Mani's opinion, for Turbo had told them—him and Marcellus—all of the sect's nonsense.

8,5 Mani teaches that there are two first principles without beginnings, which are eternal and never cease to be, and are opposed to each other. He names one light and good, but the other, darkness and evil, which makes them God and the devil.[54] But sometimes he calls them both gods, a good god and an evil god[55]

8,6 All things stem and originate from these two principles. The one principle makes all good things; the other, likewise, the evil things. In the world the substances of these two principles are mixed together,[56] and

---

[53] 7,5 to 8,3 is quoted, in slightly expanded form, from Act. Arch. 14.

[54] Asmussen p. 73 (Chuashtuanift VIII A), "(Ever) since we have recognized the true God (and) the pure sacred doctrine, we know 'the two principles' (roots, origins). We know the light principle, the realm of God, and we know the dark principle, the realm of Hell."

[55] This does not occur in any published Manichaean writing. Uighur Chuashtuanift VIIA (Asmussen p. 72) "And if one should ever ask, 'Who comes to the road that seduces, to the beginning of the two poison roads (and) to the gate of Hell,' (then) it is . . . the one who worships the devil and addresses him as God," perhaps suggests that some Manichaeans were guilty of this. Contrast Aug. Faust 21.1, "It is indeed (true) that we acknowledge two first principles, but we call (only) one of these God, and the other matter, or, if I may use the common parlance, the demon."

[56] Keph. 131.16–17, "They were cast in a mixture with each other, the light with the darkness and the darkness with the light." In NHC, light is mixed with darkness at Apocry. Jn. 25,4.

the one principle has made the body, while the soul belongs to the other. (7) The soul in human beings, and the soul in every beast, bird, reptile and bug is the same; and not only this, but Mani claims that the living moisture in plants is a movement of the soul which he says is in human beings.[57]

9,1 But he teaches as much other mythology when he says that whoever eats meat eats a soul, and is liable to the punishment of becoming the same himself[58]—(2) becoming a pig in his own turn if he ate a pig, or a bull, or bird, or any edible creature. Manichaeans therefore do not eat meat. And if one plants a fig tree, an olive, a grapevine, a sycamore, or a persea, his soul at his own death is entangled in the branches of the trees he planted and unable to get by them.[59] (3) And if one marries a woman, he says, he is embodied again after his departure and becomes a woman himself, so that he may be married. (4) And if someone killed a man his soul is returned to the body of a leper after departing the body, or a mouse or snake[60] or else will in his own turn become something of the kind that he killed.

9,5 Again, he claimed that since it desires < to draw up > the soul which is dispersed in all things, God's heavenly wisdom[61]—(6) (for he and his Manichaean followers say that the soul is a part of God and has been dragged away from him and < is held > as the prisoner[62] of the archons[63] of the opposing principle and root. < And > it has been cast down into bodies in this way, because it is the food of the archons who have seized

---

[57] Man. Ps. 246,25–30, (Allberry p. 54) "I am in everything. I bear the skies, I am the foundation, I support the earths, I am the light that shines forth, that gives joy to the souls. I am the life of the world. I am the milk that is in all trees: I am the sweet water that is beneath the sons of Matter."

[58] Asmussen p. 72 (Uighur Chuashtuanift V C), "If we ever, my God, somehow . . . should have killed (living beings) (then) we to the same degree owe life to living beings."

[59] A Manichaean confession of sin translated by Henning, in "Ein Manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch," Turk. Turf. VIII, APAW 1936, No. 10, p. 142, reads" . . . in grosser Unzüchtigkeit Bäume abzuhauen oder zu pflanzen (scheue ich mich nicht), am Frühlingsmorgen der Bäume Sprossen und (überhaupt) der Elemente Notlage beachten (bedenke) ich nicht; mit dem Leibe erstreben wir (ja alle) zu pflanzen und zu säen, einen Garten oder ein Grundstück."

[60] Klimkeit p. 174 (Confessional text for the elect, Sogdian with Persian citations), "why was I not (reborn) in the class of pigs, dogs or yakshas?"

[61] Cf. Tit Bost. Man. 1.17.

[62] Keph. 29,18–20 "The first hunter is the king of the realm of darkness, who hunted the living soul with his net at the beginning of the worlds."

[63] Keph. 50,22, "archons, the enemies of the light."

it and < eaten it as* > a source of strength for themselves,[64] and parceled it out among bodies.) (7) And therefore, he says, this wisdom has set these luminaries, the sun, moon and stars[65] in the sky, and has made a mechanical contrivance through what the Greeks call the twelve signs of the zodiac.[66]

9,8 He affirms that these signs draw the souls of dying men and other living things upwards, because they shine. But they are carried to the ship—Mani says that the sun and moon are ships[67] And the smaller ship loads for fifteen days, till the full moon. And so it carries them across, and on the fifteenth day stows them in the larger ship, the sun.[68] (9) And the sun, the larger ship, ferries them over to the aeon of light and the land of the blessed.[69]

9,10 And thus the souls which have been ferried over by the sun and moon < are saved* >. For of those who < have become > acquainted with his vulgar chatter, he says that they have been purified and deemed worthy of this mythical crossing of his. And again, he says that a soul cannot be saved unless it < shares > the same knowledge. And there is much sound and fury in this fabrication.

Now these were Mani's teachings, and Archelaus had been made familiar with < them by Turbo >, and because of his extensive knowledge of God and his advance < information > was fully prepared for the debate. For he had obtained precise knowledge of all of Mani's charlatanry from Turbo. And lo and behold, here came Mani, with his companions!

< Marcellus and Archelaus > came then and there to a public debate in Caschar. They had previously chosen a man named Marsipus, and Claudius, and Aegeleus and Cleobulus as judges of their disputation. One was a pagan philosopher, one a professor of medicine, another a professional

---

[64] Klimkeit p. 172 (*Confessional Text for the Elect*, Sogdian with Persian citations), "For the (demon of) Greed . . . that has formed this body . . . constandy provokes contention through these five 'gates.' (Through them) it brings the internal demons together with the external ones, in the courses of which a small part (of the soul) is destroyed day by day."

[65] Keph. 168,1–2 sharply distinguishes between the "five stars" (planets) which are evil, and the sun and moon which rule over the planets and "oppress" them.

[66] At Klimkeit p. 306 (*Apocryphal Words of the Historical Jesus*), unsatisfactory catechumens ascend to the zodiac and descend again to be reborn.

[67] Klimkeit p. 68 (*A hymn to the Third Messenger*, Parthian) "Full of joy are the divine abodes, the noble ships, the ferries that are created by the word."

[68] Man. Ps. 267,7–9, (Allberry p. 85) ". . . now in thy gifts of light . . . from ship to ship unto the Envoy in whom . . . who will ferry me across in . . ."

[69] Keph. 158, 31–32, "(The greater luminary) is the gate of light and the vehicle of peace to this great aeon of light."

teacher of grammar, and the other a sophist. (3) And after many words on both sides, with Mani advancing his fabricated teachings and Archelaus, like the bravest of soldiers, destroying the enemy's weapons by his own strength, and when Mani was finally beaten and the judges had awarded the prize to the truth—(4) that was no surprise. The truth is self-authenticating and cannot be overthrown even if wickedness shamelessly opposes the precept of the truth. For like the shadow of darkness, like the slippery footing of a snake's onset, like the snake's lack of support without feet, falsehood has no ground or foundation.

11,1 And then Mani escaped,[70] though the people would have stoned him if Marcellus had not come forward and shamed the mob with his venerable presence—otherwise, if he had stayed, the miserable dead man would have died a long time earlier. Mani withdrew and came to a village < in the neighborhood* > of Caschar called Diodoris,[71] (2) where the people's presbyter at the time was a very mild man named Trypho.[72] Mani lodged with Trypho and confused him in turn with his boasts, for he realized that Trypho, while a good man in other respects and a marvel of piety, was lacking in eloquence. (3) Even here, however, he was not able to mock Christ's servant as he had supposed he could. God's way is to prepare the gifts of the Spirit and supply them to those who hope in him, as the One who never lies has promised, "Take no thought what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of my Father which speaketh in you."[73]

11,4 And so Mani chose to debate once more, with the presbyter Trypho. Trypho answered him at many points and wrote to Archelaus about this matter, (5) "A man has come here like a fierce wolf and is trying to destroy the fold. I beg you to send me instructions on how to deal with him or in what terms I should reply to his heresy. And if you should see fit to come yourself, you would relieve the minds of Christ's fold, and his sheep." Archelaus sent him two books < for > the ready understanding of Mani, and told him to expect him in person.

11,6 At early morning Mani came into the middle of the village, pretending to challenge Trypho to debate as a colleague. And after Trypho had made his appearance, (7) and with his God-given understanding had

---

[70] Cf. Act. Arch. 43.1–2, Cyr. Cat. 6.30.

[71] Holl: εἰς κώμην τινὰ τῆς Καλχάρω περιοίκιδοϛ Διοδωρίδα καλουμένην; MSS: . . . τῆς καλχάρων εἰς Διοδωρίδα καλουμένην.

[72] At Act. Arch. 43.4 both the presbyter and the village are named Diodorus.

[73] Matt 10:19–20.

answered Mani's questions point by point to the fraud's discomfiture—[though] somewhat softly where he felt doubtful—Archelaus turned up like a powerful householder protecting his property, confidently attacked the would-be plunderer, and took him to task.

11,8 As soon as Mani saw Archelaus he said, with fawning hypocrisy, "Allow me to debate with Trypho. Since < you are > a bishop, you outrank me." (9) But together with the repudiation of that remark Archelaus silenced Mani by exposing him as an [even] greater hypocrite, and again put him to shame by answering his arguments, so that he could say nothing further. And the people once more grew angry and tried to lay hands on the offender. He, however, escaped the mob and < returned* > once more to Fort Arabio.

12,1 And then, when the king of Persia learned of Mani's hideout, he sent and arrested him in the fortress. He dragged him ignominiously back to Persia and punished him by ordering that he be flayed with a reed.[74] (2) They still have his skin in Persia, flayed with a reed and stuffed with straw.[75] And this is how he died; Manichaeans themselves sleep on reed mattresses for this reason.

12,3 After he had died like that and had left his disciples whom we have mentioned, Addas, Thomas and Hermeias—he had sent them > out before he was punished as we described—(4) Hermeias went > to Egypt. Many < of us* > met him. For the sect is not an ancient one, and the people who had met this Hermeias, Mani's disciple, described him to me. (5) Addas, however, went north[76] and Thomas to Judaea, and the doctrine has gained in strength to this day by their efforts. (6) Mani, however, said that he was the Paraclete Spirit,[77] and calls himself an apostle of Christ

---

[74] This appears only in anti-Manichaean sources, e.g., Theodore Bar Khōni (Pognon p. 184); Cyr. Cat. 6.30. Manichaean sources most often say that Mani was crucified, Man. Hom. 44,17–20; 45,9; 71,15; Man. Ps. 226,19–231 (Allberry p.19) etc. Some say that Mani died in prison, cf. Asmussen p. 57 (M 5, Parthian: MM III: 863–865) "On the fourth of the month of Shahrevar, on the Monday and at the eleventh hour, when he had prayed, he shed the wonted garment of the body."

[75] This is scurrilous, but Manichaean sources say that Mani's head was cut off and exhibited to the populace, e.g. at Man. Ps. 19,29–31.

[76] Perhaps cf. Asmussen p. 21 (M 216b, Parthian: *MM* II p. 301, n. 2 and p. 302, n. 3), "When the apostle was [in] Veh Ardashir (Seleuceia, on the west bank of the Tigris) then he sent the Teacher, Addas the Bishop . . . [and] other scribes to Byzans . . ." At p. 300 Addas goes to the east.

[77] Keph. 14,31–15,24, "In this year, the year in which Ardashir the king [was ready? to receive] the crown, the living Paraclete descended to me, spoke with me, and revealed to me the hidden mystery . . . In this way all that has come to pass and will come to pass was

on some occasions, and the Paraclete Spirit on others. And there is a great variation of the heresies in his blindness.

13,1 Now at length, beloved, I need to say < something > about the sect and its nonsense; all that precedes, I have described for your information. (2) Now then, the savage Mani begins his teaching, speaking and writing in his work on faith. (3) For he issued various books, one composed of < twenty-two sections* > to match < the > twenty-two letters of the Syriac alphabet.[78] (4) (Most Persians use the Syrian letters besides < the > Persian, just as, with us, many nations use the Greek letters even though nearly every nation has its own. (5) But others pride themselves on the oldest dialect of Syriac, if you please, and the Palmyrene—it and its letters. But there are twenty-two of them, and the book is thus divided into twenty-two sections.)

13,6 He calls this book the *Mysteries of Manichaeus*, and another one the *Treasury.* And he makes a show of other books he has stitched together, the *Lesser Treasury*, as one is called, and another on astrology. (7) Manichaeans have no shortage of this sort of jugglery; they have astrology for a handy subject of boasting, and phylacteries—I mean amulets—and certain other incantations and spells.

This is how Mani begins his book:

14,1 *There were God and matter, light and darkness, good and evil, all in direct opposition to each other, so that neither side has anything in common with the other.*[79] And this is the scum's prologue; (2) he begins his mischief there. And broadly speaking, that is the book, which contains certain bad propositions of this sort, the difficulty of which, and the contradiction at the very outset between the words and their aim, must be understood. (3) For even though the rest of his nonsense and fabricated religion is extensive, the whole of his wickedness will be shown by its introduction.

For the words, "There were God and matter," taught nothing less than the futile speculation of the Greeks. (4) But it is easy to detect, understand and refute this valueless sophistical notion. < It is plain* > to anyone with good judgment that the conclusion that there are two contemporaneous

---

revealed to me by the Paraclete . . . all that the eye beholds, the ear hears, and the thought considers . . . I knew all and saw all, and became one body and one spirit . . ."

[78] Holl: τῶν κατὰ τὴν τῶν Σύρων στοιχείωσιν <ἐκ κβ' τόμων> συγκειμένην; MSS: τῶν κατὰ τὴν Σύρων στοιχείωσιν δι' ἀλφαβήτου συγκειμένην. Other suggestions for emendation are found in Holl.

[79] Tit. Bost. Man. 1.5 gives this as a summary of Mani's teaching. A variation of it is found at Aug. Ep. Fund. 13.

eternals cannot be reached by correct reasoning and well-intended intelligence. And anyone with sense must find this out. (5) If the two [eternals] are contemporaneous they cannot be different, even in name. For anything that is contemporaneous [with one of them] is also co-eternal. But this co-eternal and ever existent thing is God, particularly as he has no cause. For nothing is eternal but God alone.

14,6 But with your barbarous mind and enmity toward the human race you have referred to these principles by different names. You have spoken of one as "light," but the other as "darkness," and again, of the one as "good" and the other as "evil." But you claim that they are in total opposition in every respect, so that neither has anything in common with the other. You separate them, then; for it is plain that they are opposites, as you have said. (7) (If they are partners, however, the partners will be found to be friendly and in agreement, because they live together in fellowship and from their profound affection never leave one another.)[80]

14,8 However, if [Mani's first principles] are separate from each other, each of them is surely bounded. But nothing that is bounded is perfect; it is limited by its boundedness. (9) Besides, a boundary will be needed for the delimitation of both, or both territories will touch at the ends, be in contact with each other through the ends, have something in common, and violate the rule of their opposition.[81] And if you grant that there is a divider between the two, (10) the divider cannot be like them, but neither can it be different from both. (11) For if the divider can be called comparable to one of the two eternals we mentioned [even] in one part of it, then, because of the comparable part, the divider cannot be different from [the eternal]. Instead it will be connected with the one with which it is comparable, there will be a junction at the part that matches, and [the divider] will no longer be bounded where it parts the two substances from each other[82]

14,12 If, however, it is not like the two and has no share of a part of either, there cannot be two eternals and everlastings; there must, in the last analysis, be three. And there can no longer be two principles, and two primordials opposed to each other. There must be another, third thing, which is opposed to both and unlike both, and which divides the two and, because of its foreignness to them, has nothing in common with either

[80] Epiphanius may here be influenced by Tit. Bost. Man. 1.5.
[81] The thought and wording here are close to that of Tit. Bost. Man. 1.7.
[82] Cf. Serap. Thm. 32.13–17.

and no likeness to either.[83] And in the end there are no longer two, but these three.[84]

14,13 And besides, another will also be required, a fourth, to mediate and set this boundary. For the two could not set the boundary or partition without another to be the umpire who put the divider between them—a skillful, wise and fair umpire, what is more, with higher rank [than either] so that he can persuade them both to a peaceable reconciliation. (14) Thus there will be one to set the boundary, one to divide, and two to be bounded, and there cannot be only two first principles; there must even be three and four. And in this way one can think of many first principles, ignoring real things and imagining unreal ones.

15,1 In the offender's effort not to allow evil, of all things, to touch God—in fact, to ascribe < evil > to God is an absurdity. In the standard form of the church's teaching it is agreed that the Godhead has nothing to do with evil and no admixture of it. (2) For God made nothing evil; he made "all things very good,"[85] since God is by nature good and of an incomprehensible essence, and contains all things but is himself contained by none. Evil, therefore, did not always exist, nor was evil made by God.

15,3 Since evil does not always exist, then, and was not made by God, it remains to examine the nature of this thing that does not always exist but has a beginning, and that is coming to its end and perishing, and has no permanence—< and > how it began. (4) And in examining this we must first consider the sort of thing that evil is and the sort of thing in which evil arises, and whether it is an object or, as it were, has a body or substance, or whether it can even have a root. (5) And when we think this through we shall find that evil is without substance and has no root, but is limited to the deeds of human activity at work. (6) While we are doing it, evil exists; while we are not doing it, it does not. It is our good judgment that discovers what it means to do evil—to do the thing that does not please God, and can neither contradict God nor resist the Godhead. For when anything can be rooted out and destroyed by men, all the more can it not hold out against God.

16,1 At the same time we must understand that the devil was not made evil by nature at the creation but discovered evildoing for himself later, and not without the knowledge of what he would become. With all creatures

---

[83] Titus of Bostra argues at Man. 1.7 that Mani's thesis requires at least three principles. Cf. Alex. Lycop. Man. 8.

[84] Cf. Tit. Bost. Man. 1.7; Alex. Lycop. Man. 8; Act. Arch. 24.7.

[85] Gen 1:31; with the argument in general, cf. Tit. Bost. Man. 2.1.

he was created well, with the utmost serviceability because of superior righteousness. (2) For though God in his supreme goodness willed that all persons and creatures be < good >, and though he offered his good gifts to all, he still, by allowing the freedom to choose, permits all creatures to undertake whichever action each chooses by its own will. Thus God cannot be responsible for the evils, though there will be a separation of those who progress to virtue and win the rewards of goodness.

16,3 But though this madman Mani (Μάνης) means to exempt God from evil, he has instead set evil over against God on equal terms. (4) And at the same time, while he is abusing all creation, he is not ashamed to use our human errors as his excuse for interweaving < a mixture of the two* > evenly matched < principles* > with all created being. He has in fact become the champion and defender of the evil he claims to forbid. And when he grants its existence and declares its eternity, and that, together with God, it always is and never ceases to be, he is embracing a sort of fondness for evil and fellowship with it instead of a hatred toward it.

16,5 And Mani's departure from the truth can be detected from his use of certain terms for evil in every subject [he discusses]. For the goodness of God's whole creation is proved by the texts Mani himself cites. (17,1) First of all he has called evil, "matter," and holds matter to be corruption in the same sense [as evil][86] And to begin with, if matter is corruption, what can it be the corruption of? If it is the corruption of other things, but matter itself is enduring, then matter would have destroyed everything long ago; and after putting its power into operation for so long without being extirpated, only it would exist.

17,2 But if matter is the corruption of itself, and if it corrupts, assails, consumes and destroys itself, it is on its way to destruction and cannot endure, since it is the source of its own destruction and corruption[87] (3) How could it have lasted for so long, as the scum claims, but at the same time have nothing at all to do with life, and not in fact < have a share > of life or goodness?

17,4 But since there is also goodness in each of the creatures Mani abuses, his account of evil is altogether mistaken; each of the principles he speaks of has something in common with the other. (5) All that is has

[86] At Keph. 31,10, and often in the Kephalaia, matter is "the thought of death.": Cf. Keph. 31,15–16, where matter forms the body of "the king of darkness and smoke," and 131,4–5 "... from the time at which death, that is, matter, is eliminated ..."

[87] A similar argument is used at Tit. Bost. Man. 1.11; cf. Serap. Thm. 79.21.1.

been made for a purpose, but the things that Mani abuses by name contain the opposite of evil. Take snakes, for example and the other < poisonous reptiles >. (6) The sources of deadly poison also contain[88] an antidote to do away with death and suffering. And the daytime is indeed for human labor, as well as for illumination and vision; but the night, which Mani disparages by name,[89] is also a rest which God has given to man.[90] (7) And so it is evident that each thing individually is good, and cannot be termed evil, or given a name synonymous with evil, because of our sins.

18,1 For all things are good and pleasant, and nothing is rejected by the God < who says >, "And behold, all things are very good."[91] And nowhere is there a root of evil. (2) This is why, when God was making the whole world by his goodness, he ascribed goodness to each of his creatures at the outset, and said, "And God saw that it was good"[92]—testifying to its goodness and confounding the shrewdness of the plotters against mankind, who want to conceal the truth from men with their evil stories. (3) For God made heaven and earth, the light, and the things on the earth, on the first day, "And he saw, and behold it was good,"[93] says the scripture. (4) Didn't he know he would make something good, then, since he says, "Behold, it is good," after it was made? And so, in succession, of the waters, the sea, vegetation, trees, the heavenly luminaries, cattle, birds, reptiles and fish. (5) For scripture said, "And God saw, and behold, it was good," in every case—but not because God did not know this beforehand or because he < learned > it after the thing was made, as though he had acquired his knowledge of its goodness by experience. Because of the opinion of the injudicious he declared in advance that all things are good, and that evil has no existence anywhere. (6) Since all things are good, and since their goodness is attested by the absolutely true testimony of the Good, < the > Privation of all that is evil and of all wickedness said, "Behold, it is good", for the refutation of men's whole artificial opinion of evil, and the demolition of the entire notion of those who introduce this mischievous teaching.

---

[88] Holl: καὶ κακώσεως <εὑρίσκεται>; MSS: καὶ κακώσεως κακιζομένων.

[89] Keph. 161,20–25, "The night reveals the sign of the darkness of its father, from whose essence it comes. For the night came from the first darkness and appeared in the world. Look at the night, the shadow of the first darkness which is made fast and bound in all things above and below." And see the entire passage, Keph. 160,18–161,25.

[90] Cf. Tit. Bost. Man. 2.18.

[91] Gen 1:31.

[92] Gen 1:4; 10; 12; 18; 21; 25.

[93] Gen 1:4.

18,7 Then, when he came to man, God did not say that man is "good," and did not say that man is "bad." And yet man is the most excellent of all earthly creatures, created by God, with his ineffable wisdom, to rule the world—and God would give him dominion over all his creatures as he says, (8) "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the air, and over the creeping things of the earth, and cattle and beasts, and over all that is on the earth."[94] (9) Since man had been made in God's image, holy writ was content with such a great dignity, which needed no further addition. (10) For if man possessed the image of Goodness itself at his creation—I mean the image of the Lord God, the artificer, and good artificer, of all creatures, the wellspring of all goodness and the source of the good in all—why would man need the further testimony of "Behold, it is good?" He had received the image of the Good himself.

18,11 But later at the end of the whole account, after the making of all of God's handiwork, the word of God, in conclusion, bore the same witness for all and said, (12) "And God saw all that he had made, and behold, it was very good,"[95] adding the word, "very." This was the sixth day, and the seventh day of rest. The point was to remove the root of [Mani's] < opinion > of evil, so that never again would anyone find an excuse for daring to believe that evil is eternal. (13) For this same account of evil had been demolished. There was no evil anywhere, for all things were very good, and had been made and witnessed to by a good God.

19,1 "Matter" can mean two things. On the one hand, in the offender's sense of the word, it is the name of an activity, as I said, and a consuming corruption. But we ordinarily say "matter" of the material < consumed* > by craftsmen in the production of every article—wooden matter, for example, ceramic matter, the matter of gold, the matter of silver. The result of the bodily process which is caused by the decomposition of food[96] is also called "matter." All right, let's have the newly arrived diviner (μάντις), who claims to have been before the ages, tell us < which kind of matter he meant* >. (2) For he even dared to say he was the Paraclete Spirit—though on other occasions he calls himself an apostle of Jesus Christ, as I said. And yet he never took the form of a dove, or put on the Paraclete Spirit who was sent to the apostles from heaven to be their garment of

94 Gen 1:26.
95 Gen 1:31.
96 Holl: βρώσεως; MSS: κακώσεως.

immortality < and* > the power < of their testimony* >. (3) The Only-begotten promised to send this Spirit, and set the time for it "not many days hence"[97] but directly after his ascension—as he said, "If I depart, he will come."[98] And on their return from the Mount of Olives, "they were filled with the Holy Spirit" at once in the upper room[99] (4) as the scripture says, "There appeared to them cloven tongues of fire."[100] And the house was filled as with a violent blast of wind, and the Spirit settled on each of them, and they spoke of God's wonders in tongues, and all heard them in their own languages. (5) For they came from every people under heaven and yet each of them was comforted by the Spirit—the apostles by the gift, and all the nations by the sound of God's wondrous teaching.

19,6 For if the Paraclete Spirit the Lord promised his disciples was this scum—this true Maniac, and bearer of the name by his own self-designation—< the > apostles went to their rest cheated of the promise, though the Lord who does not lie had told them, "Ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit after these few days."[101]

19,7 And it will be found that the fraud is falsely accusing Christ of failure to keep his word. For the apostles' generation is gone—I mean the generation from Peter until Paul, and until John who even lived until the time of Trajan. And James is gone, the first to exercise the episcopate in Jerusalem. (James was called the Lord's brother but he was Joseph's son, born, like the rest of his brothers, of Joseph's real wife. (8) Because the Lord Jesus Christ, who was born in the flesh of the ever-virgin Mary, was brought up with them, < they > were in the position of brothers to him, and he was called their brother.) And all the saints who shared James' throne are gone, and Symeon, the son of James' uncle, with them—Symeon, the son of Cleopas the brother of Joseph.

19,9 I subjoin their successive episcopates one by one, beginning with the episcopate of James—< I mean the successive > bishops who were appointed in Jerusalem during each emperor's reign until the time of Aurelian and Probus, when this Mani, a Persian, became known, and produced this outlandish teaching.

---

97 Acts 1:5.
98 Cf. John 16:7.
99 Sic! Acts 2:4 combined with 1:13.
100 Acts 2:3.
101 Acts 1:5; 2:38.

The list follows:[102]

20,1 James, who was martyred in Jerusalem by beating with a cudgel. [He lived] until the time of Nero.

Symeon, was crucified under Trajan.

Judah

Zachariah

Tobiah

Benjamin

John, bringing us to the ninth [or] tenth year of Trajan.[103]

Matthias

Philip

Seneca

Justus, bringing us to Hadrian.

Levi

Vaphres

Jose

15. Judah, bringing us to the eleventh year of Antonius.[104] The above were the circumcised bishops of Jerusalem.

The following were gentiles:

Mark

Cassian

Puplius

Maximus

20. Julian. These all exercised their office up until the tenth year of Antoninus Pius.

21. Gaian

Symmachus

Gaius, bringing us to the time of Verus, in the eighth year of his reign.

Julian

Capito

Maximus, bringing us to the sixteenth year of Verus.

Antoninus

Valens

Dolichian, bringing us to Commodus.

Narcissus

---

[102] The following list appears to be derived from a series of references in Eusebius' Chronicle. For a discussion in detail see Holl, *Panariom* II, pp. 44–47.

[103] MSS: ἑὼς δέκα ἐννέα ἔτους. Holl suggests that this is a dittography.

[104] MS: μέχρι ἑνδεκάτου Ἀντωνίου. Holl tentatively suggests μέχρι Ἱεροσολύμων ἁλώσεως.

Dius, bringing us to Severus.

Germanio

Gordius, bringing us to Antoninus.

Narcissus, the same person, bringing us to Alexander the son of Mamaea—not Alexander of Macedon, but a different one.

Alexander, bringing us to the same Alexander.

Mazabanus, bringing us to Gallus and Volusian.

Hymenaeus, bringing us to Aurelian.

20,3 According to some annalists there are 276[105] years altogether from Christ's ascension until the time of Mani, Aurelian and Probus. According to others, there are 246.

And there have been eight other bishops from that time until the present: Bazas, Hermo, Macaris, Maximus, Cyril, Herennis, Cyril once more, and Hilarion, the present occupant of the see, who is accused of consorting with the Arians.

20,4 And the successive emperors whose reigns coincided [with these last eight episcopates] are: The remaining one year of the remaining part of Aurelian's reign; Tacitus, who reigned for six months; < Probus, six years >; Carus, Carinus and Numerian, two years. Diocletian, twenty years. Maximian, Licinius, Constantine, Constantius, Julian, Jovian, Valentinian, Valens, Gratian, < 73 years altogether >. (5) Thus there are 101 years from Mani until the present, that is, till the thirteenth year of Valens, the ninth of Gratian, the first of Valentinian the Younger and the ninety-third of the Diocletian era.[106] (6) < In other words the Holy Spirit waited for 276 years in Mani* >, so that he could be sent to the world as [his] emissary in the fourth year of Aurelian and the episcopate of Hymenaeus at Jerusalem, < and > deprive and cheat his followers of the truth through the working of imposture and delusion by the devil who inhabited him.

21,1 Hence his entire trickery has been fully exposed since, through their accurate discovery of everything, the minds of the wise will surely find his false notion out. (2) And all his other beliefs are sophisms, filled with foolishness—perverse, uncertain and, to all the wise, ridiculous. < Since I intend > to analyze them phrase by phrase, and set down the arguments against them all, I am going to make the refutatory part of my work against him very bulky. (3) Marvelously good replies to him have

---

105 This figure is obtained by adding the thirty years of Christ's life to the 246.

106 I.e., 377 A.D. Epiphanius has been at work on the Panarion for approximately two years. Cf. Pan. Proem II 2,3.

already been composed by great men—by Archelaus the bishop, as has been said; and, I have heard, by Origen; and by Eusebius of Caesarea and Eusebius of Emesa, Serapion of Thmuis, Athanasius of Alexandria, George of Laodicea, Apollinaris of Laodicea, Titus, and many who have spoken in opposition to him.

21,4 Still, even in my poverty it will do no harm to make a few remarks to the wretched man's shame, in refutation of what I have already called his entirely false notion. (5) And I would prefer not to put his refutation in harsh terms but as gently as possible, except that, impudently, he does not hesitate to blaspheme the Lord of all and deny at the outset that he is the creator—this though he made this whole vault of heaven, earth, and everything in them, and everything in the world. But in imagining another God who does not exist, Mani has abandoned the One who does. (6) He has been deprived of the truth, and has had the experience in the comic proverb, where the crow had food in its mouth and saw the reflection of the food in the water, and wanting to get something else to eat, lost the food it had and still didn't get the food it didn't.

21,7 But who can tolerate the blasphemer? If we have fathers of flesh and blood and cannot bear to hear them criticized, how much more if we hear the Lord God of all blasphemed by the savage Mani?

21,8 When, in the divine goodness, storms are sent by the mercy of God, Mani is not ashamed to say blaspehmously that storms do not come from God, but from the effluent of the archons.[107] (22,1) But who could fail to laugh out loud to say the rest, since the tales of Philistion probably carry more conviction than Mani's mimes? (2) He teaches about a mythical porter who supports the whole world,[108] and says that every thirty years the porter's shoulder gets tired, and he shifts the world to the other shoulder, and < this is why > there are earthquakes.[109]

---

[107] Keph. 116,29–31 is more dignified: "(The archons) and also the tyrants, in whose heart it is to rule in the clouds, the storms (?), the winds, the pneumata and the storm-winds." With Epiphanius' version, (a parody?) cf. Act. Arch. 9.3; Cyr. Cat. 6.34; Tit. Bost. Man. 8.2.

[108] Man. Ps. 2,18–20, "The Omophorus, the great burden-carrier, who treads upon the . . . with the soles of his feet, supporting the earths with his hands, carrying the burden of the creations." Cf. Act. Arch. 8.2.

[109] At Keph. 93,16–19 the earthquake "in the watch of the Porter" is a primordial one, and is caused by a rebellion in the depths: "Again, during the watch of the Omophorus who humbles . . . there was a rebellion of the depths below . . . bowed, and the fastenings beneath came loose . . . in the foundation below." Cf. NHC Orig. Wld. 102,25–31. Outside of Epiphanius, the shifting of the porter's pole is found only at Timothy Presbyter PG 86, 21A.

22,3 But if this were so, the thing would be a fact of nature, not supernatural. (4) And the Savior's words refute the charlatan, for he said, "Become good like your Father in heaven, for he maketh his sun to rise on the just and on the unjust, and sendeth his rain on the evil and on the good,"[110] and, "There shall be earthquakes in divers places, and famines and pestilences."[111] (5) If earthquakes were natural or normal, < but > perhaps there were frequent quakes in a country and the earth happened to shake many times a night for a whole year, would that be because the porter's shoulders hurt, and he was uncomfortable and made the quake continuous? And who can endure this sort of nonsense?

22,6 But what else < in >credible has he not dared to say? For he claims that souls which have acquired knowledge of his imposture are taken up into the moon, since the essence of the soul is luminous. (7) This is why the moon waxes and wanes, he says; it becomes filled with the souls which have died in the knowledge of his unbelief. (8) Then, he says, they are offloaded from the moon—the smaller ship, < as > he calls it—to the sun. And < the sun > takes them aboard and deposits them in the aeon of the blessed.

22,9 But wickedness is always blind, and unaware of its own shame—how it is refuted by its own words, because it cannot make its lies consistent. (23,1) For one man was formed to begin with, Adam, and had sons and daughters. But in the beginning of the creation, around Adam's hundredth year, Abel was killed at roughly the age of thirty[112] (2) After this first victim of murder the first man, Adam, died, at about the age of 930. But the sun, moon and stars had been fixed and established in the sky on the fourth day of creation. (3) Now what should we say, Mister? Should we agree that your stupidity has been exposed? How could 930 years go by without the moon's waning and waxing? (4) With which departed souls was the sun filled and loaded? Well? But Mani did not know that there are wise persons who cannot be convinced by lying words, but [only] by the most authentic proofs.

23,5 But if we do grant that this is so—heaven help us, it can't be! [But if we grant that it is so], and the moon, in growing full, is crammed with the souls of Manicheans, still how can such a proposition be sustained?[113]

---

[110] Matt 5:45.
[111] Cf. Mark 13:8.
[112] Jub. 2.10.
[113] At Man. 22 Alexander of Lycopolis bases his anti-Manichean argument on the fixed periods of the moon's waxing and waning.

(6) If no Manichean died after the fifteenth of the month, and it was fore-ordained that Manicheans would die up until the fifteenth, but no more after the fifteenth until the moon's cargo had been unloaded to start loading again at the new moon, their lie would be convincing. As it is, it is unpersuasive. (7) Manicheans die every day, and the heavenly bodies which God has ordained know their course. And once more, the slop[114] about the souls in the moon, which he has made up, won't do.

24,1 Again, some of them < concoct another story* > with villainous intent, < and* > say that the Mother of all[115] allowed her power to come down from heaven to steal < from > the archons[116] and rob them of the power they had taken from on high. (2) For Mani says that the principalities and authorities made war on the living God and seized < his* > great and incomprehensible < essence* > from him, a power which he calls the soul.

24,3 How very absurd of him! Whoever is seized and handled with violence has been bested. If the principalities oppressed the good God and took power from his armor, they must be more powerful than he. (4) And if he gave in to them to begin with, he does not have the ability to take the power, or armor, which they stole from him back from them[117]—not when he was unable to resist his enemies in the first place.

24,5 To put it another way, suppose that he could win a victory at some time, prevail over his antagonists, and take back the power they had stolen from him. Since the root of evil, its first principle with no beginning, would still be in existence and impossible to destroy altogether, it would win in another war, prevail by the exercise of some power, and again take more power from the good God, as well as his power which he had taken back. (6) And evil will always be ranged against the good God and never controllable, so that it will be forever seizing and being seized.

---

[114] Epiphanius is apparently punning on γόμος, which can mean either "cargo" or "soup."

[115] In Manichean theology the Mother of all is usually the first emanation from the Father. She does not ordinarily interact directly with earthly beings. Cf., however, Keph. 71,21–23, "If (the Mother of Life) had descended and come down, by [her own will alone], from the Father's height to the earth, [she would have spent a thousand] years, and ten thousands . . ."

[116] Keph. 124,28–29, "Thus when the matter that is in them is oppressed . . . and robbed . . ." Cf. PS IV.136 (MacDermot pp. 354–355), "But the base of the moon was of the type of a boat, and a male dragon and a female dragon steered it, while two white bulls drew it. And the likeness of a child was at the back of the moon, and guided the dragons as they stole the light of the archons from them."

[117] Cf. Tit. Bost. Man. 1.23; 30.

24,7 But even though these people, whose wits are damaged < and > who are in every way deluded, say that if the good God frees the part of his armor that has been seized from him, he will then do away with the principalities and authorities of the opposing power and destroy them altogether—even if this will happen, and the good God will indeed get rid of them entirely and destroy them,[118] the scum's argument is still all wrong. For he is claiming that the "good" God is not just and does not condemn the sinner, either by consigning him to torments or by putting him to death. (8) For if he makes any attempt to do away with the devil, or opposing power, and destroy him, either he cannot be good in himself, as Mani's account of him says he is; or, if he is good and still destroys evil, then this Lord who made heaven and earth must be < just >, as in fact he is, since he "rendereth to every man according to his deeds."[119] For with extreme goodness he provides the good man, who has grown weary in well-doing, with good, and metes out justice to the evildoer. (9) And it has been shown in every way that Mani's talk gradually turns men's hearts to the opposites [of his teachings].

25,1 But next I appropriately insert Mani's doctrine word for word as Turbo himself revealed it, one of Mani's disciples whom I mentioned earlier, taking this from Archelaus' arguments against Mani in the debate with him. (2) When the bishop Archelaus, and Marcellus, questioned Turbo about Mani's teaching, Turbo replied in the words I quote from the book. They are as follows:[120]

25,3 *The beginning of Mani's godless teachings*

If you wish to learn the creed of Mani, hear it from me in a concise form. Mani believes in two gods, unbegotten, self-engendering, eternal, and the opposites of each other. And he teaches that one is good and the other evil, and calls the one Light, and the other, Darkness.[121] *The soul in human beings is part of the light, but the body is part of the darkness and the creature of matter.*[122]

---

[118] Cf. Tit. Bost. Man. 1.30.

[119] Rom 2:6.

[120] 25,3–31,8 are quoted from Act. Arch. 7.13.

[121] Keph. 286,127–30, "[the] two essences which are primordial . . . light and darkness, good and evil, [life and] death . . ."

[122] Cf. Henning, "Ein Manichäischer kosmogonischer Hymnus," NGWG 1032 pp. 251–253, ". . . matter is distributed which (in) itself is seven she-demons. The first one is the skin . . . (. . . she, i.e., Greed, Az) took, and she made this carrion, the microcosm, in order to be made joyful through it . . ."

25,4 *Now < Mani > says that a mixture or confusion of these has come about as follows, likening the two < gods > to the following illustration: Suppose two kings were at war with each other,*[123] *and they had been enemies from the first, and each had his respective territory. But in the battle the darkness sallied forth from its territory and assailed the light.* (5) *Now when the good Father found the darkness had invaded his land he emitted a power from himself called Mother of life,*[124] *and she emitted First Man < and clothed him* > with the five elements.*[125] These are wind, light, water, fire and matter.*[126] (6) *Putting these on as battle gear, he went below and did battle with the darkness.*[127] *But as they fought against him the archons of the darkness ate part of his armor,*[128] *that is, the soul.*

25,7 *Then First Man was fearfully hard pressed there below by the darkness. And if the Father had not heard his prayer*[129] *and sent another power he had emitted, called Living Spirit, and if Living Spirit had not descended and given First Man his right hand and drawn him out of the darkness,*[130] *First Man might well have been in danger of capture long ago.*

25,8 *After this First Man abandoned the soul below. And when Manicheans meet they give each other their right hands*[131] *for this reason, as a sign that they have been saved from the darkness. For Mani says that all*

---

[123] Keph. 4,1–2, "the darkness made war on the light, because it desired to rule over an essence that was not its own." In the NHC, cf. Tri. Trac. 84,6–17.

[124] Keph. 71,19–20, "at the time when the Mother of Life was called forth from the Father of Greatness."

[125] Keph. 153,23–24, "[At] the time when the First Man put on the elements and (stood firm) against the first enmity that originated in the darkness"

[126] "Matter" is never a Manichean element; Epiphanius appears to misunderstand Act. Arch. 82.17; 83.18; 23. The fifth Manichean element is either air or ether.

[127] This key episode in the Manichean story is continually alluded to in Manichean literature. Treatments at length are found, among others, at Keph. 38,8–40,16; 271,30–273,9.

[128] Cf. Asmussen p. 121 (Fragments M 1001, M 1012, M 1015, Middle Persian; Ed. W. Sundermann, lines 113–133), "Thus [it was] that God, [the First] Man, appeared. And again, to all these powers it (i.e., the Light) was like a sweet meal before hungry ones; When it stands before them, they all devour it; . . ."

[129] Asmussen p. 122 (M 21, Parthian: *MM* III: 890–891), "The God Ormizd prayed to his mother, and his mother prayed to the righteous God: 'Send a helper to my son, for he has carried out your will, and he has come into oppression.' " This is comparable to the prayer of the Logos at Tri. Trac. 81,26–82,14, and of Sophia in other Valentinian documents.

[130] Keph. 39,19–21, 'The second right hand is the one that Living Spirit gave to First Man after drawing him from the contest . . ." At NHC Gosp. Tr. 30,14–23, "the Spirit" gives his right hand to (Adam ?).

[131] This, and similar gestures, are discussed at length in Chapter 9 of the Kephalaia, Keph. 38,1–41,34.

the sects are in the darkness. Then Living Spirit created the world[132] *and he himself descended clothed with three other powers, brought the archons up and crucified them in the firmament,*[133] *which is their body, the sphere.*

26,1 *Then in turn, Living Spirit created the luminaries, which are remnants of the soul*[134] *and made them circle the firmament. And he created the earth in its turn, in eight forms.*[135] *But beneath it* < *is** > *the Porter, who bears* < *it on his shoulders** >*; and whenever he gets tired of bearing it he shivers, becoming the cause of an earthquake out of its time.* (2) *This is why the good Father sent his Son* from < *his* > *bosom to the heart of the earth and its lowest depths, to give the Porter his due punishment.*[136] *For whenever there is an earthquake he is either trembling from fatigue or shifting the earth to his other shoulder.*

26,3 *Next, matter too created growing things from herself. And since they were being stolen by certain archons, she called all the chief archons, took power from each,*[137] *made this man in the image of that First Man,*[138] *and bound the soul in him.*[139] *This is the reason for the mixture.*

26,4 *But when Living Father saw the soul squeezed into the body, in his mercy and compassion he sent his beloved Son for the soul's salvation—for*

---

[132] See Asmussen pp. 122–123 (T III 260e 11=M 7984 II, Middle Persian: *MM* I 177–181) for a lengthy account of the creation by Living Spirit. There are frequent references to this in the Kephalaia.

[133] Keph. 26.28–31 "This is the second night . . . which was brought up by Living Spirit and put in the [mixed world] below and above"; 27.10–12 ". . . the second night which the Living Spirit has crucified in the [mixed world] below and above."

[134] Luminaries made from the remains of the soul are found only at Alex. Lycop. 19 and Bar Khouni in Pognon p. 189. But note Keph. 269,21–23, "The second image (in man) is the remnant and remainder of the new man, the psychic image which is bound in the flesh."

[135] Keph. 118,23–25, The second part is the eight earths beneath, the four that are mixed and the four places of darkness."

[136] On the contrary, at Keph. 9.6–11 Jesus comes to the Porter's aid: "Again, since the earth beneath the porter escaped the making fast . . . for this reason Jesus came below, putting on Eve until he arrived at the first place. He ordered and fastened the fastenings that were below, and returned and ascended to the rest." At NHC Orig. Wld. 102,25–103,2 Pistis sends her breath to bind the "trouble-maker" below, who is making the heavens shake.

[137] Klimkeit p. 41 (*Verses from a hymn on the Third Messenger and the Archons*, Parthian) "Filth and dross flow from (the Demon of Wrath) to the earth. They clothe themselves in manifold forms and are reborn in many fruits." Cf. NHC Orig. Wld. 114,24–30, "And at that time, the prime parent then rendered an opinion concerning man to those who were with him. Then each of them cast his sperm into the midst of the navel of the earth. Since that day, the seven rulers have fashioned man . . ."

[138] At Keph. 138,6–14 Matter sees the image of the third Messenger (not of First Man), and then enters the tree of life and becomes its fruit. The archons eat the fruit and then make man.

[139] Keph. 95,15–17, "But his [soul] [he] took from the five splendid gods [and bound] it in the five members of the body. He bound the mind . . ."

he sent him [both] for this reason and on account of the Porter.[140] *And when the Son arrived he changed his appearance into a man's and appeared to men as a man, though he was not one; and people supposed that he had been begotten [like a man].*[141] (6) *And when he came he created the things that were meant for the salvation of* souls[142] and *set up a device with twelve water jars which is turned by the sphere and draws up the souls of the dying. And the greater luminary takes these with its rays, cleanses them and transfers them to the moon, and this is how what we call the disk of the moon becomes full—for Mani says that the two luminaries are ships, or ferry-boats.*[143]

26,7 *Then, if the moon is filled [with souls], it ferries them across to the east wind, and thus gets its load dislodged and is lightened, and begins to wane.*[144] *And it fills the ferry-boat again, and again discharges its cargo of the souls which are drawn up by the water jars, until it has saved its part of the soul. For Mani says that all soul, and every living and moving thing, is a partaker of the essence of the good Father.*

26,8 *When the moon has delivered her load of souls to the aeons of the Father, they remain in the pillar of glory, which is called the perfect air.*[145] *But this air is a pillar of light, since it is full of souls being purified. This is the reason the souls are saved.*

---

[140] Keph. 267,28–268,1, "Jesus has not come and saved the world only on man's account . . . He has come and appeared on earth . . . But after he was through working outside, in the great cosmos, he came . . ." and 1) revealed himself to Adam and Eve; 2) dispatched apostles in every generation to preach the Manichean message of salvation.

[141] Cf. Asmussen p. 103 (M 24 R 4–8=M 812 V 1–4 Parthian: W. B. Henning, "Brahman" TPS 1944, p. 112) "Grasp, all believers, the truth of Christ, learn and wholly understand his secret: He changed his form and appearance"; Man. Hom. 11,5–6, "[Jesus] was [sent] to it; he came and took the form (?) of a body . . ."; Man. Ps. 191,4–11, "Amen, I was seized; Amen again, I was not seized. Amen, I was judged; Amen again, I was not judged . . . I mocked the world, they could not mock me."

[142] Keph. 61,22–24, "until he went and descended into the plasma (!) of the flesh, and set up earths and all plants."

[143] Man. Ps. 10,30–11,2, "the sun and the moon he founded, he set them on high, to purify the soul. Daily they take up the refined part to the height, but the dregs they erase . . . they convey it above and below. Keph. 159,25–26, "(The sun) removes the darkness with its light and sweeps it away, NHC Treat. Res. 45,9–46,2 The departed "are drawn to heaven by him, like beams of the sun"; this constitutes the "spiritual resurrection."

[144] Keph. 108,20–22, "through the manner of the garment of the wind, in which he appeared, [Living Spirit] has swept out and scraped out all the shadows of destruction and dirt, and poured it down on the earth."

[145] The pillar of glory is regularly called the "perfect man," (ἀνήρ) not the "perfect air (ἀήρ)." However, in Manichean poetry the ideas approach one another, cf. Man. Ps. 83,25–27, "Hail, Perfect Man, holy path that draws to the height, clear air, mooring-harbor of all that believe in him."

27,1 *But this, in turn, is the reason why people die.*[146] *A lovely, beautifully adorned Virgin, very attractive, is attempting to rob the archons who have been brought up by Living Spirit and crucified in the firmament. She appears as a lovely women to the males and as a handsome, desirable youth to the females.*[147] (2) *And when the archons see her with all her adornment they go mad with love; and because they cannot catch her*[148] *they become dreadfully hot, and their minds are ravished with desire*[149] (3) *Now when they run after her the Virgin disappears. Then the chief archon emits the clouds to darken the world in his anger; and if he is extremely vexed he perspires and is out of breath, like a man. And his sweat is the rain.*[150]

27,4 *At the same time, if the archon of destruction*[151] *is robbed by the Virgin, he sheds pestilence on the whole world to slay human beings.*[152] *For this body of ours may be called a < miniature* > world which answers to < this > great world,*[153] *and all people have roots below which are fastened to the realms on high.*[154] *Thus, when the archon is robbed by the Virgin, he begins to cut men's roots.* (5) *And when their roots are cut a pestilence sets in and they die. But if he shakes the heavens by [tugging at) the cord of their root, the result is an earthquake, for the Porter is moved at the same time. This is the reason for death.*

---

146 The Virgin of Light is often associated with death, cf. Man. Ps. 84,30–32, "Draw not the veil of thy secrets until I see the beauty of the joyous image of my Mother, the holy Maiden, who will ferry me until she brings me to my city." At Keph. 244,9–13 and regularly in Pistis Sophia, the Virgin of Light is a judge and assessor of departed souls.

147 Klimkeit p. 68 (*A hymn to the Third Messenger*, Parthian) "The mighty powers, the giants eager for battle, withdraw light from all creatures. In two bright forms they seduce the demons of wrath." For a longer version see Theodore bar Khouni (Pognon p. 190).

148 Cf. NHC Apocry. John. 19,18–20,5; Nat. Arc. 87,33–88,15; Orig. Wld. 115,3–116,8.

149 Cf. Asmusssen p. 132 (M 741 Mary Boyce, "Sadwes and Pesus," BSOAS, Vol. 13, No. 4 (1951); pp. 911–913) "Bright Sadwes shows her form to the Demon of Wrath; by her own (nature) she seduces him. He thinks she is the essence (of light). He sows . . . he groans when he no longer sees the form. Light is born in the sphere; she gives it to the higher Powers. The dirt and dross flows from him to the earth. It clothes itself in all phenomena, and is reborn in many fruits. The Dark Demon of Wrath is ashamed, for he is distraught and had become naked. He had not attained to the higher, and had been bereft of what he had achieved."

150 Cf. Tit. Bost. Man. 2,32. At Keph. 240,19–243,8 clouds are formed in the image of the Virgin of Light. The archons steal power from them and the angels pursue the archons; this is the cause of lightning. And see the note preceding.

151 Keph. 153,29, "archons of death"; 153,34, "warrior of destruction."

152 Keph. 169,5–8, "But when the robbery is on the side of Gemini, Libra and Aquarius, there is a loss and diminution everywhere in the seal (?) of mankind."

153 Keph. 169,29–170,1, "this whole world above and below answers to the form of the human body, while the fashion of this body of flesh answers to the form of the cosmos."

154 Keph. 124,15–17, "but the root of man . . . is not in the whole earth, but only in this southern world."

28,1 *And I shall also tell you how the soul is reincarnate in other bodies.*[155] *First a little of it is purified, and then it is put into the body of a dog or camel, or another animal. But if a soul has committed murder, it is put into the bodies of lepers.*[156] *If it is found to have reaped grain, it is put into stammerers. (These are the names of the soul: reason, mind, intelligence, thought, understanding.)*[157]

28,2 *But reapers, who reap grain, are like the archons who were in the darkness*[158] *at the beginning, when they ate some of First Man's armor. Thus they must be reembodied in grass, beans, barley, wheat or vegetables*[159] *so that < they too > may be reaped and cut down.* (3) *Again, if someone eats bread*[160] *he must become bread himself and be eaten. If one kills a bird, < he too > will be a bird. If one kills a mouse, he will also be a mouse.*[161] (4) *And again, if one is rich in this world, he must be reembodied in a poor man when he leaves his tabernacle, so that he may go begging and after this go away to eternal punishment.*[162]

28,5 *Since this body is the body of the archons and matter, whoever plants a persea must pass through many bodies until that persea is planted. But if anyone builds a house,*[163] *bits of him will be put into all the kinds of bodies there are. Whoever bathes*[164] *plants his soul in the water.* (6) *And whoever does not give his alms to the elect will be punished in the hells and reincarnate in the bodies of catechumens until he gives many alms. And for this reason they offer the elect whatever food is their choicest.*[165]

---

155 Cf. Keph. 223,29–31; 225,8–11; 27–28; 249,32–250,3 et al.

156 Cf. Tit. Bost. Man. 2.35.

157 These are regularly called the "limbs" of the soul; cf. Keph. 76,16–25.

158 Keph. 26,13, "the whole band of archons, which is in the world of darkness"

159 Henning, "Bet- und Beichtbuch," APAW 1936, No. 10, pp 32–33, "Wenn (ich) zulasse . . .(er) die fünf pflänzlichen Geschöpfe, seien sie feucht oder trocken, entzweitritt oder zerstückelt, verletzt oder zerreisst . . ."

160 At CMC 97,11–17 Mani says that Elxai, the founder of the "baptists," at the bidding of the bread itself, forbade his followers to bake bread.

161 Klimkeit p. 169 (*Confessional Text for the Elect*, Sogdian with Persian citations) "If (I should have allowed) the weight of my body, the cruel [self . . .] to beat or hurt (that Light) . . . by injuring . . . the five (types of) fleshly beings . . ."

162 Keph. 116,22–25, "Before the dregs and sediment (?) of the darkness were swept out of creation, [Hells] were established for them to be the receptacle of the dregs until the dissolution of the world."

163 Klimkeit, p. 169 (*Confessional Text for the Elect*, Sogdian with Persian citations) "If (I should have allowed) the weight of my body, the cruel [self] to bear or hurt that light . . . by digging or shoveling, building or constructing a wall in the dry, cracked, injured, oppressed and trodden earth . . ."

164 At CMC 94,5–9 Mani says that a face appeared in the water to Elxai, the founder of the "baptists," and forbade him to bathe.

165 Keph. 166,13–16, "But whoever loves (the elect) and deals with them through his alms, will live and be victorious with them and will be delivered from this dark world"

28,7 *And when they are about to eat bread they pray first, and tell the bread, "I neither reaped you, nor ground you, nor pounded you, nor put you into an oven; someone else did these things, and brought you to me. I have been eating without guilt." And whenever [an electus] says this for himself, he tells the catechumen, "I have prayed for you," and the catechumen withdraws.*[166] (8) *For as I told you a moment ago that whoever reaps will be reaped, so whoever throws wheat into a thresher will be thrown in himself—or if he kneads dough he will be kneaded, or if he bakes bread he will be baked. And for this reason they are forbidden to do work.*[167]

28,9 *And again, < they say that > there are other worlds, since the luminaries set from this world and rise in those.*[168] *And whoever walks on the ground injures the earth*[169]*—and whoever moves his hand injures the air, because the air is the soul of men, animals, birds, fish, reptiles and everything in the world. < For > I have told you that this body does not belong to God but to matter, and that it is darkness and must itself be made dark.*[170]

29,1 *But as to Paradise, which is a name for the world: Its plants are lusts and other impostures which destroy men's reasonings. But that plant in Paradise through which the good is recognized is Jesus*[171]*< and > the knowledge of him in the world."*[172] *One who takes [its fruit] can distinguish good from evil.* (2) *The world itself, however, is not God's but was formed from a part of matter, and all things are therefore destroyed.*[173]

---

166 Cf. Asmussen p. 50 (T II E = 6020 I, Parthian: Henning, "A Grain of Mustard," *Annali, Ist. Or. Napoli* Sc. 2 Line 6 (1965) pp. 29–30), "(The elect) himself will be saved, he will also save him who gave the alms-food, and it (i.e., the Living Soul, self) will reach the dome of the gods unharmed." Cyr. Cat 6.32 calls this prayer a curse on the catechumens, cf. Tit. Bost. Man. 2.32.

167 CMC 93,2–11, "See how the disciples of the Savior . . . did not work in the tillage and husbandry of the soil . . ."

168 Holl: καὶ ἐκείνοις ἀνατελλόντων; MSS: ἐξ ὧν ἀνατέλλουσι

169 Klimkeit p. 169 (*Confessional text for the elect*, Sogdian with Persian citations) "If (I should have allowed) the weight of my body, the cruel [self . . .] to beat or hurt that Light while walking or riding, ascending or descending, (walking) quickly or slowly . . ."

170 Man. Hom. 6,1–8, "I shall (judge?) my body and pronounce its condemnation, 'Cursed art thou, O [body] . . . Thy lust is condemned in thee . . . Thy demons shall enter . . . Thou hast tormented me . . . Thou hast caused [me] to weep . . . year after year I show thee no reverence . . . thou hast brought them upon me. Cursed art thou . . . cursed is he that made thee.' "

171 Perhaps cf. Keph. 53,26–28, "Afterwards he planted his good plantings, the tree of life which bears good fruit. So it is with the likeness of the coming of Jesus the Splendor."

172 Cf. CMC 84,9–16, "the purity which has been spoken of is the purity that comes by knowledge, the distinction of light from darkness, death from life, and the living waters from the astonied," and many other Manichean praises of knowledge.

173 Man. Hom. 39,22–27, "Then, after Jesus, comes the destruction of the world . . . the flesh shall vanish altogether and be uprooted from the world. If the . . . flesh is destroyed and perishes and . . . [the All] is cleaned up. The world . . . and it shall remain waste . . ."

The thing the archons stole from First Man is the very thing that fills the moon, and is cleaned out of the world every day. (3) *And if the soul departs without knowing the truth, it is given to the demons to subdue in the hells of fire.*[174] *And after its punishment it is put into < other > bodies to be subdued, and so it is thrown into the great fire until the consummation.*[175]

30,1 *Now this is what he says about your prophets. There are spirits of impiety or iniquity which belong to the darkness that arose at the beginning, and because the prophets were deceived by these they did not tell < the truth >. For < that > archon has blinded their minds.*[176] (2) *And anyone who follows their words will die forever, imprisoned in the clod [of earth], because he did not learn the Paraclete's knowledge.*[177]

30,3 *Mani has commanded only his elect, of whom there are no more than seven,*[178] *"When you finish eating, pray and put on your heads oil which has been exorcized with many names, as a support for this faith." The names have not been revealed to me for only the seven employ them.* (4) *And again, < he says > that the name of Sabaoth, which is revered and of great importance among you, is human in nature and a father of lust. And so, he says, the foolish worship lust, thinking it is God.*

30,5 *This is what he says about the creation of Adam. The person who said, "Come, and let us make man in our image and after our likeness"*[179]*—that is, "in accordance with the form which we have seen"—is the archon who told the other archons, "Give me of the light which we have taken and let us make a man in the form of us archons < and > the form we have seen, which is First Man."*[180]

---

[174] Cf. Fihrist al-'Ulum (Flugel, p. 101) "Wenn aber dem sündigen Menschen . . . der Tod erscheint, so nahen sich ihm die Teufel, packen und quälen ihn . . . Dann irrt er in der Welt unaufhörlich umher von Peinigungen heimgesucht bis zu der Zeit, wo dieser Zustand aufhört und er mit der Welt in die Hölle geworfen wird."

[175] Keph. 29,12–14, "Blessed is anyone who is perfect in his works, that, at his end, [he may escape] the great fire which is prepared for [the world] at the end of time."

[176] At Aug. C. Faust. 16.6 Faustus says, "Moses' tradition is so dissimilar to Christ's, and so very different, that if the Jews believed one of them they must certainly repudiate the other." In contrast, both CMC 62,9–63,1 and Man. Hom. 75,22 appear to praise the prophets.

[177] Keph. 233,25–27, "one (portion of his sins will be forgiven him) because he knows the knowledge and has distinguished light from darkness . . ."

[178] This might be a misunderstanding of the Greek version of Act. Arch. 63.5, where the Latin reads, "nomina quaedam invocare coepit quae nobis Turbo dixit, solos septem electos didicisse," which means, not that there were only seven elect, but that only seven of the elect knew the names.

[179] Gen 1:26.

[180] In the Kephalaia the archons usually make man, in the likeness of Third Messenger. Cf. Keph. 133,5–134,7; 135,14–26; 157,7–9; 158,3–5.

And so they created the man. (6) *But they likewise created Eve and gave her some of their lust for Adam's deception. And the fashioning of the world from the archons' handiwork was done through Adam and Eve.*

31,1 *God has nothing to do with the world itself and takes no pleasure in it, because it was stolen from him by the archons at the beginning and became a burden to him. This is why he sends emissaries and steals his soul from them (i.e., the archons) every day through these luminaries, the sun and the moon, by which the whole world, and all creation, is taken away.* (2) *Mani says that the god who spoke with Moses, and with the Jews and their priests, is the archon of darkness; thus Christians, Jews and pagans are one and the same*[181] *since they believe in the same god.* (3) *For as that god is not the God of truth, he deceives them with his lusts. Therefore all who hope in that god, the god who spoke with Moses and the prophets, must be imprisoned with him, since they have not hoped in the God of truth. For that god spoke with them in accordance with his lusts,*

31,4 *After all this he finally says, as he himself has written.*[182] *When the elder*[183] *makes his image*[184] *manifest, the Porter will drop the earth*[185] *outside. Then the great fire will be let loose and consume the whole world.* (5) *Next he will drop the clod < that is interposed > between [the world and] the new aeon, so that all the souls of sinners may be imprisoned forever. These things will take place when the image arrives.*

31,6 *But all the emanations—Jesus, who is in the smaller ship, Mother of Life, the twelve steersmen, the Virgin of Light, the third Elder, who is in*

---

[181] At Aug. C. Faust. 18.5 Faustus argues that on Christian premises, to become a Christian one must be a Jew. Cf. 1.2; 16.10 and Ut. Cred. 10.14.

[182] Neither the identity of the document alluded to, nor the extent of the quotation, is clear.

[183] This is Third Messenger, cf. 31,6. The Greek should be πρεσβεύτης; rather than πρεσβύτης; the error is presumed to have originated in the archetype, and persists throughout Sect 66.

[184] Keph. 54,12–19 "until the time of the end, when he shall waken and arise in the great fire, and shall gather his own soul and form himself into the last image . . . he gathers the life and light which is in all things, and builds it on his body."

[185] Fihrist al-'Ulum (Flügel, *Mani*, p. 90), "während dieses geschieht, erhebt sich der Engel, dem das Tragen der Erden obliegt, und der andere Engel steht von dem Nachsichziehen der Himmel ab, so dass sich das Höchste mit dem Untersten vermischt und es lodert ein Feuer auf und frisst sich fort in diesen wirren Dingen, und hört nicht eher zu brennen, bis das, was sich in ihnen noch vom Licht befindet, aufgelöst ist."

the larger ship, Living Spirit, the wall of the great fire,[186] *the wall*[187] *of the wind, the air, the water, and the living fire within—have their dwellings < on high* > near the lesser luminary, until the fire destroys the whole world over a period of years whose length I do not know.*[188] (7) *And after this there will be a restoration of the two natures, and the archons will occupy their own realms below, while the Father will occupy the realms above, and have received his own back.*[189]

31,8 *Mani imparted this entire teaching to his three disciples and told each of them to make his way to his own area: Addas was assigned the east, Syria fell to Thomas, but the other, Hermeias, journeyed to Egypt. And they are there to this day for the purpose of establishing the teaching of this religion.*

32,1 These are the passages I have quoted from the book by Archelaus that I mentioned. And this is the way Mani introduc<ed> the seed of his tares to the world when he belched out the tares of his teaching. (2) One could offer quantities of answers to however much there is of this mime's slander, as must be plain to everyone. For even if the counter-arguments are not polished, the mere knowledge that this is what they believe will be enough to put them to shame, for their tenets are shaky and have no cogency. (3) For Mani overturns his earlier statements with his later ones, and says things later that are different from what he has said earlier. He sometimes would have it that the world is God's creation, but sometimes that it comes from the archons and that God bears no responsibility for it, but that it is slated to perish. And sometimes he says that the firmament is the archons' hides, but sometimes that they are crucified up above in the celestial sphere—< and > that they chase people, and make clouds, and get excited and wild at the sight of the virgin and the handsomeness of the youth.

33,1 What a disgrace! What could be worse, more disgusting, and more shameful than for the Spirit of truth to change himself into a female, but

---

[186] Keph. 108,25–29, "By his splendor, by his might, he has poured the fire of the darkness out from all the archons, cast it on this earth, and again, swept it off the earth and bound it in the vehicle that encompasses the whole world and so is called the wall of the great fire."

[187] Le Coq, Türk. Man. II, APAW 1904, pp. 38–39, "Fahrzeuge zwer, Jesus der Sonne . . . mit fünf Mauern, einer ätherischen, windigen, leuchtenden, wassrigen und einer feurigen . . ."

[188] At Müller, Handschriftliche Reste aus Turfan II APAW 1904, p. 19, the number of years is given as 1468. So in the Fihrist al-'Ulum Flügel p.90.

[189] More typical is Keph. 52,17–19, "The light goes to its own land but the darkness remains in bonds and chains forever."

sometimes to appear in male form to the archons? It is disgraceful for a man to get drunk and act and look like a woman. But for women to act like men and dress in men's clothes is the most disgraceful of all. (2) And if this spirit is the Spirit of virtue, and divine, why will it not have been insulted rather [than glorified] by its inventor Mani? And how can the archons go wild after having been skinned? Tell me that, Mister! How were they skinned after being crucified? And if they have indeed been crucified, how can they run after the power when it disappears?

33,3 Who can put up with the blasphemer, with his declaration that we draw our nourishment from the archons' sweat, and that the rain pours down on us from their dirty fluids? How can Mani drink himself—since he, along with his disciples, draws his water from the rain? What else can he be but absurd, to be so mastered by bodily needs that he drinks sweat?

33,4 There are various degrees of sin, and the unintentional sinner will not be punished as severely as the one who commits the sin deliberately. (5) Even if this were true—and perish that thought, it's the nut's imagination—[but if it were true], then people who draw and drink sweat and dirty fluids without knowing it < are > excusable, and more entitled to mercy than someone who succumbs to his own frailty and, for no good reason, is moved to draw and drink water, with full knowledge, from the archons' drinks and their other bodily functions.

34,1 And there are many ways in which he has deceived his followers with his lying mouth. Which of his notions is not absurd? The idea that seeds of herbs, produce and pulse are souls! (2) To venture < a > joke, to refute him in terms of his own mythology I may say that if the seeds of lentils, beans, chick-peas and the rest are souls, but the soul of a bull is the same, then, on his premises, people who eat meat have more to their credit than ascetics do. (3) For as his rigmarole goes, he is afraid that if he eats living things—(4) animals and the rest—he will become like them himself. < But > on the contrary! For if fifty, or even a hundred men get together all dine on one bull, as his vain calumny goes < they are all guilty of murder together* >. But in refutation we must still say that the fifty, or the hundred, become guilty [of the murder] of one soul, but someone who eats the grains of seeds will be guilty of ingesting thirty or forty souls at one gulp! And all the things he says are worthless and absurd.

35,1 For to everyone whose mind < is established > in the Lord, the signs of the truth must surely be apparent from the true teaching itself; as a revelation of men's salvation, nothing is more reliable than the Savior. (2) This barbarian who has come to us from Persia and has the mind

of a slave—being a slave physically never bothered him—says that all souls are alike and that the one soul is in all: people, domestic animals, wild beasts, birds, reptiles, creatures that fly and swim, bugs and the seeds of produce, trees and all other visible things. (3) But our Lord didn't tell us this. When he came to save humanity did he also see to the cure of cattle, and < start on* > the healing and resurrection of dead beasts by gathering < their bones* >? He neither described this nor taught this to us, (4) far from it, but he knew the saving of human souls, as he said concisely in the riddle, "I am not come but for the lost sheep,"[190] meaning all humankind.

35,5 And what does scripture say? "He healed all whom they brought unto him, that were lunatick and were taken with diverse diseases."[191] They brought him the blind, the deaf, the lame, the palsied, the maimed, and he extended his benefaction and healing to all of them; but scripture nowhere says that they brought him animals.

35,6 Then again, "He came to the parts of Gergestha,"[192] as Mark says—or, "in the coasts of the Gergesenes," as Luke says;[193] or "of the Gadarenes," as in Matthew,[194] or "of the Gergesenes" as some copies [of Matthew] have it.[195] (The site was in between the three territories.) (7) "And behold two possessed with devils, exceeding fierce, coming out of the tombs, and they cried out, saying, Let us alone, what have we to do with thee, Jesus thou Son of God, that thou hast come before the time to torment us? We know thee who thou art, the holy one of God. And there was an herd of swine there feeding and the devils besought him saying, If thou cast us out of the men, send us into the swine. And they ran violently into the sea and perished in the waters. And they that kept them fled and told it in the city."[196]

35,8 And in Matthew we are told of two possessed, but it simply mentions swine and does not give the number. (9) But Mark even reported the exact number of the swine and said, "He came unto the parts of Gergestha, and there met him one possessed of a devil, and he had been bound with iron chains and plucked the chains asunder, and he had his

190 Cf. Matt 15:24.
191 Matt 4:24.
192 Cf. Mark 5:1, but this reading is found only in Epiphanius and Theophylact.
193 Luke 8:26.
194 Matt 8:28.
195 Matt 8:28 as read in ℵ^{c}, L, W, X et al.
196 Matt 8:28–33.

dwelling among the tombs and cried out, Let us alone, what have we to do with thee, Jesus thou Son of God? Thou hast come before the time to torment us. And Jesus asked him, What is thy name? And he said, Legion, for many devils had entered into him. And they besought him not to be sent out of the country, but to enter into the swine. For there was there an herd of swine feeding, and he gave them leave to enter into the swine. And the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea (for they were about two thousand) and were choked in the sea. And they that fed the swine fled, and told it in the city."[197]

35,10 Then did the divine Word who had become man for us ask in ignorance, and not know the demon's name before he asked? No, it is the Godhead's way to make the causes of each event clear from through the lips of persons who are questioned. (11) And here too, to show the frightfulness and the great number of the demons, he asks the question, so that the marvelous deed will be made known out of their own mouths. "And the devils besought him saying, Send us not into the abyss, but give us leave to enter into the swine. And he gave them leave. And the devils went out and entered into the swine, and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea, and perished in the waters."[198]

36,1 What great kindness of God! How he confounds falsehood but shows his servants the truth, through deeds, words and all of his care! For he has shown by a deed that the same soul is not in people, cattle and beasts. (2) If the soul were the same, why did he not refrain from destroying two thousand souls at once when his aim was to purify one person or save one soul, the demoniac's? If it were the same, why did he purify the one man or < save > the one soul, but permit the demons to enter the other bodies, or indeed, the other souls?

36,3 Are the deeds of the light not plain to see? Are these words not "performed in the light?"[199] Is the truth's face not radiant? Are "all things" not "plain to them that understand, and right for them that find knowledge?"[200] Who can hear and look into these things without convicting Mani of stitching together things that should not be stitched, to divert men's minds from reality?

36,4 But the offenders in their turn < try to evade the truth* >. I have even heard one argue in this way: after he had heard this argument from

197 Mark 5:2–14.
198 Mark 5:12–13.
199 Cf. John 3:21.
200 Prov 8:9.

me the oaf turned round and thought he might get somewhere against God's truth. Offering a completely absurd defense < he dared >[201] to make it out that the truth < agrees > with falsehood, and said, "But he had reserved death for the swine; their souls escaped from their bodies and were saved!"

37,1 The stupidity of the people who can't see, and who blind their minds, and don't even listen to what they themselves say! (2) If he had any idea that the deliverance of souls from the body is salvation, the Savior should have killed the demoniac so that his soul would be saved by its deliverance from a human body. He must have loved the souls in the swine more than the soul of the man! (3) Why didn't he let the man plunge into the sea with the pigs and die too, so as to purify and save all of the souls, the man's and the pigs'?

37,4 But we have seen nothing of the kind. The Savior calls Lazarus from the tomb on the fourth day following his death, raises him and restores him to the world, and not to do him a disservice or cause him harm. The scripture says, *Jesus *loved* Lazarus."[202] (5) If flesh is evil, why did Jesus make the man he loved return to the flesh? Why didn't he leave him alone instead, once he had died and been delivered from the body?

37,6 And no one should suppose that Lazarus promptly died again. The holy Gospel makes it clear that Jesus reclined at table and Lazarus reclined with him. Besides, I have found in traditions that Lazarus was thirty years old when he was raised. (7) And he lived another thirty years after < the Lord > raised him and then departed to the Lord. He lay down and fell asleep with a good name, and like us all, < awaits* > the hour of the resurrection when, as he promised, the Only-begotten will restore the body to the soul and the soul to the body and "reward every man according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad."[203]

38–39, 1[204] For if there were no resurrection of bodies, how could there be "gnashing of teeth?"[205] And don't anyone make that halfwitted remark again, "Teeth are made for us to chew with; what food will we eat after the resurrection of the dead?" (2) If Jesus ate again after his resurrection, and [took] "a piece of a broiled fish and an honeycomb,"[206] and lived with

---

201 Holl: ἐτόλμησεν; MSS: ἐνόμισε, "expected to."
202 John 11:5.
203 2 Cor 5:10.
204 Numbered as in Holl.
205 Matt 8:12.
206 Luke 24:42.

his disciples for forty days, will there be no food? (3) And as to food, it is plain that "Blessed is he who shall eat bread in the kingdom of heaven."[207] And it is the Lord's own promise that "Ye shall be seated at my Father's table eating and drinking."[208] (4) And what this eating and drinking is, is known to him alone, for "Eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him."[209]

38–39,5 But now that we have reached this stage of describing the differences between souls, < we have explained* >—and on the authority of the truth itself and its perfect Example—that a man's soul is one thing, and a beast's is another. And Christ did not come to save the soul of the beast but the soul of the man, since beasts are not judged. (6) For human beings inherit the kingdom of heaven, and human beings are judged. "These shall go away into everlasting judgment and these to life eternal,"[210] says the Only-begotten.

40,1 And what do the people accomplish who go hunting for problems? Whenever they find them and do not grasp the interpretation of the text, they distress themselves by thinking of contradictions instead of looking for things that are of use to them—for Matthew says that there were two demoniacs, but Luke mentions one.

40,2 And indeed, < besides this > one evangelist says that the thieves who were crucified with Jesus reviled him; but the other disagrees, and < not > only shows that both did not revile him, but gives the defense of the one. (3) For "He rebuked the other and said, Dost not thou fear God seeing that we are in the same condemnation? But this holy man hath done nothing < amiss >." And he exclaimed besides, "Jesus, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." And the Savior told him, "Verily I say unto thee, today shalt thou be with me in Paradise."[211]

40,4 These things make it seem that there is disagreement in the scripture. But it is all smooth. (5) Even if there are two demoniacs in Matthew the same ones are to be found in Luke. Since it is the scripture's way to give the causes of events, Luke mentions not the two, but only the one, for the following reason. (6) There were two men healed of demon possession, but one persevered in the faith while the other came to grief. And so,

---

207 Luke 14:15.
208 Luke 22:30.
209 1 Cor 2:9.
210 Matt 25:46.
211 Luke 23:40–43.

because of his perseverance in the faith, he followed Jesus "whithersoever he went,"[212] as the Gospel says. This is why Luke omitted the one thief and mentioned the one who is in the kingdom of heaven. And nothing can be contrary to the true interpretation.

41,1 But the Gospel now gives another reason, similar to this instance, [for speaking of more than one person] as though of one. The Lord had cleansed ten lepers and the nine had gone away without giving glory to God. But the one had turned back and remained—the one who was also commended by the Lord, as he said, "Ten lepers were cleansed. Why hath not one of them returned to give glory to God save only this stranger?"[213] (2) And you see that, because of this man's perceptiveness and his demonstration of gratitude, the Gospel mentions the one in place of the ten. It is a comparable case, since the same evangelist spoke of the thieves.

41,3 For we are accustomed to speak of singulars in the plural, and plurals in the singular. We say, "We have told you," and, "We have seen you," and, "We have come to you," and there are not two people speaking, but the one who is present. And yet by customary usage the one says this in the plural, in the person of many. (4) Thus the Gospel's[214] narrative included [many persons] by its use of the plural, but the other [Gospel] tells us that one was the blasphemer, but that the confessed and attained salvation.

41,5 And you see that all parts of the truth are plain, and there is no contradiction in the scripture. (6) But I suppose I've made my statement of the argument lengthy by going over all this scriptural material. Let me wear myself out by the time the argument takes, but confound < the > truth's < opponents* > and, with the truth's healing remedies, bring joy to her sons.

42,1 Next, let's look at the scum's other teachings. He claims that the two Testaments contradict each other,[215] and that the god who spoke in the Law is different from the God of the Gospel.[216] The former god he terms "the archon"; but in the latter case, < where he posits a good

---

[212] Cf. Luke 8:38; 9:57.

[213] Luke 17:17–18.

[214] I.e., Matthew's.

[215] Man. Ps. 57,11–14 "[He] cries out in the Law saying: I am God . . . who then led Adam astray and crucified the Savior?"

[216] Cf. Asmussen p. 14 (M 28 I, R II, 24–26; V I, 32–34; MM II p. 314), "If he (Adonay) is the Lord of everything, why did he crucify the Son?"

God, he calls him Father, just as the Son* > says that his < Father* > is a good God.

And if he would only tell the truth, and not blaspheme himself by mistake! (2) We ourselves agree with the same proposition, that the good Offspring of a good Father—light of light, God of God, very God of very God—has come to us in order to save us. "He came unto his own" property, not someone else's, "< and > his own received him not. (3) But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, who were born, not of blood, nor of flesh, but of God."[217] (4) And yet, surely no one in the world has been born without flesh and blood; all people are flesh and blood. What were they before they were born in the flesh, or what can we do without flesh? (5) But since the world is God's creation and we are creatures of flesh and born of fathers and mothers, the Lord came to beget us "of Spirit and of fire."[218]

For we have been born, and that is true, and no one can deny his first birth, or that he is made of flesh. (6) But our second birth is not of flesh or blood, that is, it is not by the commerce of flesh and blood. In the Spirit we have gained a flesh and soul that are no longer carnal, but are blood, flesh and soul in a spiritual union. (7) In other words, "To them gave he power to become the sons of God"[219]—those who had been converted, and had pleased God with flesh, blood and soul.

42,8 Thus He who came to "his own" is no stranger, but is Lord of all. And this is why he says, "Lo, here am I that speak in the prophets." And he told the Jews, "Had ye believed Moses ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me";[220] and, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad";[221] (9) and, "Thus did your fathers unto the prophets";[222] and, "Blessed are ye when men shall revile you and say all manner of evil against you falsely. Rejoice and be glad, for great is your reward in heaven. For so persecuted they the prophets before you."[223] And in another passage he says, "Jerusalem, that killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent, how often would I have gathered thy children?"[224]

---

217 John 1:11–13.
218 Cf. Matt 3:11.
219 John 1:12.
220 John 5:46.
221 John 8:56.
222 Cf. Luke 6:23.
223 Matt 5:11–12.
224 Matt 23:27.

42,10 Now the words, "how often" show that he had taken care to "gather" Jerusalem through his prophets. For if he says "killing the prophets" in reproof, then he cares for the prophets. But in caring for the prophets he was not caring for strangers, but his own. (11) He says, "And the blood that has been shed shall be required, from the blood of Abel unto that of the righteous Zacharias, which was shed between the temple and the altar."[225]

< And see how he cares for the temple as well; in another passage he says* >, (12) "And he took them all away, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and said, Make not my Father's house an house of merchandise."[226] And to Mary and Joseph he said, "Why is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be in my Father's house?"[227] And the Gospel is quick to add, "Make not my Father's house an house of merchandise," as it says, "And the disciples remembered that it was written, The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up."[228] (43,1) And how much there is to say, in < words > such as these of the* > Gospels and Apostles, in refutation and < rebuttal > of Mani's madness, with his desire to divide and separate the Old Testament from the New, even though the Old Testament testifies to the Savior and the Savior acknowledges the Old Testament.

43,2 And not only that, but the Savior testifies that he is the son of David, as he says,[229] "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand. If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?"[230] (3) And again in another passage, when the children cried Hosannah to the son of David and "He did not rebuke them"—< and when > the Pharisees say, "Hearest thou not what these say? Bid them be silent," he replies, "If these were silent, the stones would have cried out."[231] (4) For he is David's son in the flesh but David's Lord in the Spirit, and both statements are cogent and accurate. There is no falsity < in > the truth.

43,5 But so as not to lengthen this argument I shall content myself with these texts and go on to the others, for the scum's full refutation. If the body belongs to one god, Mister, and the soul belongs to another,

---

225 Cf. Luke 11:50–51; Act. Arch 32.6.

226 Matt 23:27.

227 John 2:16.

228 John 2:17.

229 Holl ἑαυτὸν υἱὸν Δαυὶδ δραματουργοῦντος, ὡς λέγει Δαυίδ, MSS οὐ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι, ὡς λέγει Δαυίδ.

230 Matt 22:44–45. At Aug. C. Fort. 19 Fortunatus calls attention to the apparent discrepancy between the Davidic sonship and the Virgin Birth; cf. Aug. C. Fort. 22.1.

231 Cf. Luke 19:39–40.

what association can the two have? (6) And I am afraid that this modest person's small mind is trying to peer into some pretty deep thoughts. So I shall hold myself in check in order not to give heavy reading to persons who can refute the cheat completely with one item of evidence. (7) Common partnership is not to be found in those who differ, but is the work of one friend or the business of two. Now if the body and the soul are together, this is the work of one God. For there is no distinction, since both work duly together and are in agreement.

43,8 But if, after eating the soul as Mani claims, the archons made this body as a prison for it, how can they lock it up in a body again after it is eaten? Whatever is eaten is consumed, and whatever is consumed also passes into non-existence. But something that passes into non-existence is no more and is not enclosed in any place; there neither is, nor can be, a prison for it if it does not exist.

44,1 But Mani often loses track of his own notion, forgets what he has said, and unknowingly again breaks down what he once built up. He sometimes claims that the soul has been eaten < and has vanished, even though* > he declares that it is shut up in the bodies that presently exist. But sometimes he decides that it has been snatched from on high from the good God's armor by the archons, so that it has not been eaten yet but is being held prisoner.

44,2 But at times he says in disagreement with this that the soul has been taken prisoner and < defeated* >, but tells the same story in a different way, (3) claiming that it has been set out as bait, of its own free will, by the power on high[232]—like a kid thrown into a pit to catch a beast of prey, which is excited and leaps down get the kid, < and thus* > the beast itself is caught.

44,4 Now suppose that the power on high—that is, the good God, or the "light," as Mani calls it—did send the "kid," < a bit of > its own power. In the first place, even if he catches the beast, the kid will be eaten up in the meantime. And rather [than helping itself], the power on high will harm itself by offering part of itself as food for the beast, to catch the beast with the part it sees fit to lose. (5) And it will no longer conquer the beast because of its power and supremacy, and the might of its reason and will;

---

232 Man. Ps. 9,31–10,7, "Like unto a shepherd that shall see a lion coming to destroy his sheep-fold: for he uses guile and takes a lamb and sets it as a snare that he may catch him by it; for by a single lamb he saves his sheep-fold. After these things he heals the lamb that has been wounded by the lion: this too is the way of the Father, who sent his strong son." And cf. Act. Arch. 28.2.

to enable itself to master the beast it employs all sorts of schemes, and plays the knave. (6) And even if the beast is caught, the good God will still have lost the kid that got eaten, from a part of himself—assuming that he can catch the beast at all.

44,7 For if the power on high sent the soul here to catch and bind the principalities and authorities, he has not achieved the goal he planned on. (8) Even though he sent the soul to catch, it has been caught. Although he sent it to trap, it has been trapped. For it came from a pure essence and was subjected, first to the prison of the material body, and then to many enormities of sins. And the fraud's argument, and the offender's teaching, fail in every respect.

45,1 Now then, let's see too about Mother of Life. Mani says that she too was emitted < from the > power < on high >, and that Mother of Life herself < emitted > both First Man < and > the five elements which, as he says, are wind, light, water, fire and matter. (2) Putting these on as battle gear, First Man went below and made war on the darkness. But during their battle with him the archons of darkness ate part of his armor, that is, the soul.

45,3 What low comedy on the scum's part! What < efforts > to prove an unintelligible joke and an absurd story![233] Mani is positively attributing powerlessness to God, absolutely ascribing ignorance to God the omniscient! (4) For the God who emitted Mother of Life, as Mani says, is to be blamed either for not knowing what would be produced from Mother of Life, or for not knowing that the events which occurred contrary to his expectation < had* > turned out other than < he thought they would* >. (5) For whoever expects things to happen, but finds that something else has happened later against his wishes, must be charged with ignorance.

45,6 For Mother of Life, whom Mani calls a power, < is born of God* > as his emanation, something it is "a shame even to say."[234] No one of sound mind can suppose that there is anything female in the Godhead. (7) But this female too, says Mani, emitted First Man < and the five elements as a mother bears a child >. And in a word, Mani imagines the First Man < he speaks of >,[235] and Mother of Life, in terms of our experience. For by "man" we mean [the first man] on earth, and by the "mother < of life >"[236] who bore us, the woman God created for Adam.

---

233 Holl ἐπιχειρήματα, MSS τὰ ἐπίχειρα.
234 Eph 5:12.
235 Holl ὅν φησίν, MSS τὴν φύσιν.
236 Holl τῆς ζωῆς, MSS ἐκ τῆς γῆς.

45,8 But, based on his own thinking, the oaf imagines that there are the same sorts of thing in heaven that there are on earth—though as the sacred scripture everywhere teaches, this cannot be. (9) For scripture says, "There are celestial bodies and bodies terrestrial: but the glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another."[237] And < the apostle > had not yet given any description of the things above the heavens, but only of these visible things, which are body—I mean < the bodies of > the sun or moon, or the creatures on earth and the bodies of the saints—or so, with all humility, I suppose. (10) I have no way of deciding whether, because of the apostle's profound capacity for knowledge, there was also to be a discussion < of > the realms above the heavens. But in any case it has been said that < heavenly things > are very < different > from earthly; how much more the things above the heavens? < All right >, Mister, how can they be compared with things on earth?

46,1 And what else can you be doing but < imagining* > First Man < as well* >—who, you say in turn, made wind, light, fire, water and matter for his armor < to fight with the darkness* >? (2) If First Man is from on high, and yet has come here in order to make his armor[238] and emit it to protect and strengthen himself, then the things that are in this world must be more powerful than the one who came down < from > the heavens. (3) For "water" is the water we can see, "light" is visible light, "matter" is 'what you claim is in decay; "wind" is what sounds in our ears, and "fire" is this fire which we use every day for our needs.

46,4 And if he battles the archons with such things, tell us, what gets the battle started? Who is to be our commanding officer and blow the trumpet? Should we break through the ranks, should we combine to oppose the wings? (5) Who should cast the first spear—going by the raving maniac's < talk >—at the stuff of the archons and authorities? (6) Does the wind fight, Mister? Does matter, which you say is in decay? Does fire, which the Lord has made for our use? Does light, which gives way to darkness at the successive intervals ordained by God? Does water? How? Explain your vaporings!

---

[237] 1 Cor 15:40.

[238] Epiphanius assumes that First Man must obtain the elements from the earth. Manichean teachings make these elements heavenly: Keph. 69,27–31, "At this very same time the First Man drew near to his clothing, the shining gods, and spoke with them, (saying) that he would surrender them . . . He [appeared] to them and made them aware of everything . . . He clothed himself with them and put them in order . . ."

46,7 In fact we see that, really, [both] good and evil deeds are done with these elements. Sacrifices are offered to idols by fire, and the fire does not object, or prevent the sin. Daemon-worshipers pour libations of sea water, and no one attempting folly with water has ever been stopped. (8) How many pirates have committed murders with sea water? If anything, water is not opposed to the archons of wickedness, as you call them. Instead, water is their ally, though the water is not responsible; every human being is responsible for his own sin. And how much you talk!

46,9 What good did manufacturing armor and wearing a breastplate made of the elements do your First Man, he who came down to fight and was swamped by the darkness? For you claim that the Man was oppressed there below. (10) But the Father heard his prayer[239] you say, and sent another power he had emitted, called Living Spirit. (11) Raise your mask, Menander, you comedian! That is what you are, but you conceal yourself while you recite the deeds of adulterers and drink. For you say nothing original—you mislead your dupes by introducing the Greeks' works of fiction in place of the truth. (12) Hesiod, with his stories of the theogony, probably had more sense than you, and Orpheus, and Euripides. Even though they told ridiculous stories, it is plain that they are poets and made things up that were not real. But to compound the error, you tell them as though they were.

47,1 You claim that this Living Spirit came below, offered his right hand, and drew your so-called First Man out of the darkness, he being in danger below in the depths—he who had descended to save the soul[240] when it had been eaten, and could not save it but fell into danger himself. (2) Though he was sent on a mission of rescue he was endangered, and someone else was needed to be sent to his rescue! (3) How much more endangered must the soul be when the First Man, when he came, was endangered on its account?

But there was a second messenger sent to the rescue, which you say was Living Spirit. (4) Did the Father change his mind, then, and send someone still more powerful to be the savior of First Man? Or was he at first unaware that First Man lacked the power, and did he think that he would save the soul? < But > did he find this out by experience later when First

---

239 Keph. 38,32–39,2, "He bowed his [knee as he prayed] to the God of truth and all the aeons of light who belong to the house of his people and as he petitioned for a power to accompany him when he would withdraw . . ."

240 Keph. 76,34–36, "Again (the First Man) [is like a man] whose two sons have been taken from him . . . [he] came to them to save them."

Man fell into danger, and emit [Living Spirit] and send [him]? (5) What a lot of nonsense, Mani! Your silly statement of your whole teaching is incoherent gibberish.

47,6 He claims in turn that Spirit descended, offered his right hand, and drew the endangered First Man up. Because of this mystery he taught his disciples to offer their right hands when they meet as a sign, as though they have been saved from darkness. (7) For he says that everything, with the sole exception of himself, is in darkness. Well, to make a joke, blind men avoid bad words better than the sighted, and see a great deal by hearing.

48,1 And next, to make other devices and furnishings for us, Mani claims—as though he had been there, though he is imagining things with no existence—that this Living Spirit then made the world. Clothed with three powers himself he too descended, brought the archons up, and crucified them in the firmament, which is their < body >, the sphere. (2) And yet the oaf does not realize how he contradicts himself with his "brought them up," and how he finds fault with things he commends and makes the things he finds fault with commendable—like a drunkard who goes staggering around and babbling one thing after another.

48,3 For he claims that the archons in the darkness below are made of evil stuff, and that < the realms below* > are the place of corruption. (4) Now if, when Spirit forcibly brought the archons up from this corruption and dark realm to < the > heights—as a punishment, if you please!—if he brought about their departure from evil places and drew them aloft for a punishment, the realms above cannot be good, and made of the stuff of life. They must be made of the stuff of death; and the realms below cannot be a punishment, but must be of a nature somehow good. (5) And because Spirit meant to move the archons as a punishment, as a way of punishing them he took them from pleasant, familiar places to a place of punishment.

48,6 And here is a different argument. If Spirit made the world, why do you say, on the contrary, that the world was not made by God? And if the firmament is the archons' body, to which cross did Spirit fasten the archons? For you sometimes say that they are fastened in the firmament, but sometimes declare that the firmament itself is their body.[241] (7) And

[241] Cf. Bar Khōni at Pognon p. 188, "Alors l'Esprit ordonna a ses trois fils que l'un tuat, que l'autre ecorchat les Archontes, fils des tenebres, et qu'ils amenassent a la Mere de la Vie. La Mere de la Vie tendit le ciel de leurs peaux; elle fit onze cieux, et ils jeterent leurs corps sur la tierre de tenebres."

your arguments show a great inconsistency, with no correspondence with the truth. < You are defeated* > everywhere you have assailed us—assailed yourself, rather, and those who have adopted your opinion.

49,1 Then in turn the same man says that after crucifying the archons in the sphere Spirit made the luminaries, which are remnants of the soul. (2) What confused doctrine, and what false and incoherent statements! Any "remnant" is a part of a whole, but the whole is larger than the remnant. (3) If, then, the luminaries are the remnants Mani should show us < something > larger than the luminaries, so that we can see the soul! (4) But if the whole has been eaten and consumed, and the luminaries are its remnants, since they are beneath the crucified archons they will get eaten too, because the archons have the position on top. (5) But if they can no longer remain in possession of the soul and luminaries because of being crucified, then, Mani, your silly account is wrong!

49,6 Then in turn the same man teaches that after rebuking the Porter, Matter created all growing things for herself. And when they were stolen by the archons the great archon called all the archons and the chief of them, took one power apiece from them, made a man in First Man's image and imprisoned the soul in him. This is the reason for the combination [of soul and body]. (7) But Living Father is kind and merciful, says Mani, and sent his beloved Son to the soul's rescue when he saw the soul oppressed in the body. For Mani claims that he was sent for this reason, and because of the Porter. (8) And on his arrival the Son changed himself into the likeness of a man and appeared to men as a man, and men supposed that he had been begotten [like a man]. (9) Thus he came and did the creating which was intended for men's salvation, and made a device with twelve water jars, which is turned by the sphere and draws up the souls of the dying. And the greater luminary takes these with its rays, and purifies them, and transfers them to the moon; and this is how what we call the moon's orb becomes full.

50,1 And do you see how much there is of this charlatan's silly nonsense and drunken forgetfulness? For he consigns his own words to oblivion, whatever he seems to say he revises and reverses, demolishing his own doctrines by describing them in a whole series of different ways. His later teachings destroy his earlier ones and he rebuilds the things he originally demolished, (2) as though to show that they are not his own but that, like the delirious, he is driven by an unclean spirit to tell one story after another.

50,3 For he either means that the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ < came before the creation of the stars, or that the stars were made long

after the creation of the world. But it is obvious* > that the advent came many years after the creation of the luminaries and the thing Mani calls the "device" of the twelve water jars. (4) The stars have been in the sky ever since their creation. Whether they prefer to call them "elements" or "intervals and measurements of the sky," they have all been put in place since the fourth day of creation, "well," and not to the harm of God's subjects. (5) But Christ's advent < came* > in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar. < For* > he began his preaching < at this point* >, thirty years after his birth, coincidentally with the 5509th year of creation and the thirtieth of his age—[and] until the crucifixion in his thirty-third year.

50,6 Now [if Christ came and made them], why were these in the sky from the beginning, the luminaries and stars? But if he says that Christ came before this to make them, his nonsense is confused. What he calls elements, and the twelve "water jars" as he futilely terms them, and the "device" by which[242] he wants to deceive his dupes with nice names, were made before man was on earth.

51,1 For it is plain to anyone with sense, from the scripture itself and its sequence, that all the stars and luminaries were made on the fourth day of creation, before the making of Adam the first man. (2) But Mani says, "He came in the form of a man to make the twelve water jars, and appeared to men < as > a man." Since he does not even know God's original provision he thinks he has something to say. Like a blind man serving as his own guide he tells the people he has blinded whatever lies are handy. (3) But when the truth arrives and opens < up > the eyes of the wise, it makes a joke of his nonsense. To which men did Christ "appear" when there weren't any? How could he "appear in the form of a man if he didn't take a body?" (4) And if he did things during his advent in the flesh, when he "appeared" to be a man but wasn't one, the things he did were an appearance. In that case he neither appeared nor came!

51,5 For if he was not real when he came, neither did he come at the beginning. If he was supposed to be a man but was not a man, what impelled God's Word to appear as a man when he was not one? Unless he was being hounded by money-lenders, and wanted to disguise himself so as to get away from his creditors! (6) But if he indeed appeared and yet wasn't there, what sort of "truth" was this? There can be no lie in truth, as the Only-begotten says of himself, "I am the truth and the life."[243] But

[242] Holl δὶ ἧς, MSS ἦν.
[243] John 14:6.

life cannot die and the truth cannot be subject to change, or it would jumble the truth up and no longer be truth. (7) And Mani's dramatic piece is a failure for every reason. Neither were the stars created after Christ's advent, nor were there human beings before the creation of the stars. And as I have just shown, the fraud Mani is confounded, both by the latter fact and by the former.

52,1 But on the subject of the moon, he says that its orb is filled with souls. Now how could the moon's orb get full before anyone on earth had died? How could the one soul, the first person to die after the nine hundred and thirtieth year of Adam's life,[244] fill the moon's orb? (2) Or why were the 930 years also called "< the > times," if the moon did not wax, wane and run its appointed course, not by being flooded with souls but by God's command because it had the ordinance of his wisdom? (3) But Mani says that all living things are filled with the same soul—thus equating the souls of a man, a mouse, a worm, and the other bodies the origins of which are nasty.

52,4 But now for the rest of his nonsense. [When he says] how the virgin appears to the archons, sometimes in the shape of a man but sometimes in that of a woman, he is probably describing the passions of his own lusts and reflecting his daemon's hermaphrodism. (5) Then he says that when the chief archon is robbed by the so-called virgin he emits his clouds, causes pestilence and begins cutting the roots, and thus the result is death. (6) And yet the oaf has not seen that what he disparagingly calls "death" should rather be called "life," because of deliverance from bodies of the soul. (7) But if the archons have any inkling that the soul's residence in a body is an imprisonment, the chief archon will never do such a thing as to release the soul, which Mani claims he holds captive, from prison. And how much absurdity is there in this tricky teaching?

53,1 But their other complete absurdities, such as their so-called "elect."[245] They have been "chosen," all right—by the devil for condemnation, in fulfillment of the words of scripture, "and his choice meats."[246] (2) For they are drones who sit around and "work not, but are busybodies,"[247]

---

[244] Epiphanius overlooks, for the moment, the death of Cain.

[245] Keph. 166,4–9, "At the time when I leave the world and enter the house of my people, all my elect will be drawn to me, and I will gather them in that place, and draw each one of them to me at the time of their departure. I will not leave one of them in the darkness."

[246] Hab 1:16.

[247] 2 Thes 3:11.

"knowing < neither what they say nor whereof they affirm* >."[248] The holy apostle denounces them because of his prophetic knowledge that certain idle, stubbornly evil persons will be making their rounds,[249] not by God's teaching but because the devil has made them crack-brained. (3) < For >to give a parody of the occupation of these idlers he says, "If any does not work, neither let him eat!"

53,4 Manicheans instruct their catechumens to feed[250] these people generously. They offer their elect all the necessities of life, so that < whoever > gives sustenance to elect souls may appear supposedly pious. (5) But silly as it is to say, after receiving their food the elect all but put a curse on the givers under the pretense of praying for them, by testifying to their wickedness rather than their goodness. For they say: *"I* did not sow you. *I* did not reap you. *I* did not knead you. *I* did not put you into the oven. Someone else brought you to me and I eat. I am guiltless." (6) And if anything, they have stigmatized as evildoers the persons who feed them—which, indeed, is true. No one who denies that God is the maker of all should take nourishment from God's creatures < except > as an ironical gesture.

53,7 The elect do not cut the cluster themselves but they eat the cluster, which shows them up as out-and-out drunkards rather than persons with a grasp of the truth. (8) For which is the worse? The harvester cut the cluster once, but the eater tormented and cut it many times over, with his teeth and by the crushing of each seed, and there can be no comparison between the one who cut it once and the one who chewed and crushed it. (9) < But they do this* > only to give the appearance of < abstaining from God's creatures* >, < while proving by their* > phony behavior how much evidence of the truth Mani has.

54,1 Then again he speaks impudently of Paradise, which is what he says the world is. The trees in it are < evils* >, he says—for anything we approve of, he denies, to show that he is truly the serpent's dupe. Just as the horrid serpent corrupted the ear of the blameless Eve, so also he corrupts the ears of Mani. (2) For Mani says that what we call trees in

---

[248] 1 Tim 1:7.

[249] Manichean sources indicate that the behavior of the elect sometimes gave scandal; cf. the chapter, 'The Catechumen Who Found Fault with the Elect (and Asked) Why He Was Irritable," Keph. 219,2–221,7. Augustine portrays the elect as unpleasant people at Mor. Man. 2.29–31.

[250] Keph. 189,6–11, "He who shall [give] bread and a cup of water to one of my disciples in God's name, in the name of the truth I have revealed, he shall become great before God and surpass the four great kingdoms in their greatness."

Paradise are the deceits of lusts, which corrupt men's reason. But the tree in Paradise whereby they learn to know the good is Jesus himself, the knowledge in the world. And anyone who takes that fruit can tell good from evil.

54,3 And you see how he perverts everything that is right, although the apostle expressly and emphatically teaches, "I fear lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity and innocence that is in Christ."[251] And see how he pronounced him a fraud and villain, and the deceiver of Eve. (4) And once more, in another passage the same apostle says, "A man ought not to have long hair, forasmuch as he is the glory and image of God."[252] And you see how he called hair the glory of God, though it is grown on the body and not in the soul. (5) And afterwards he says, "Adam was not deceived, but the woman sinned by falling into transgression. Notwithstanding, she shall be saved by childbearing, if they continue in the faith."[253] And see how the real truth is proclaimed in the sacred scripture, while Mani makes futile boasts—or rather, makes himself ridiculous in the eyes of persons of sound mind.

54,6 Then again he explains here that the world is not God's but has been made from a part of matter. But because he is not consistent, but goes back and forth plastering over the places he builds up and pulls down, it is plain to everyone that this sort of doctrine is the doctrine of a fool.

55,1 He describes transmigrations of souls from body to body, plainly borrowing this lie from Plato, Zeno the Stoic, or some other victim of delusion. (2) For how can the soul get into one body from another? If bodies came ready-made and received souls in this condition, his pompous fiction would have some plausibility. (3) But since the embryo develops from a tiny drop, how did the soul find such a broad passage into so small a body? For this is how bodies are formed; what Mani says cannot be proved.

55,4 Neither do souls migrate from body to body; no body is formed in any living thing without the intercourse of female with male and male with female. Now, is this the way the soul has come to be, to climax the tramp's theater piece with the union of two bodies? And people who even think such things are very strange.

---

[251] 2 Cor 11:3.
[252] 1 Cor 11:7.
[253] 1 Tim 2:14–15.

55,5 But not to alter things that deserve respect, I am content just to give a glimpse of the subject, as though from a distance. I shall pass on from such a degrading idea; all suppositions of this sort are outrageous. (6) For if there is a migration of souls from body to body, and someone who was once a man later < becomes > a dog, why isn't a dog born from a man or an ox? Why isn't a bird? If indeed it should be that some monster is born during the immensely long course of history, this happens for a sign. (7) Even nature knows its own boundaries and does not change a man's nature and make him, contrary to nature, into something else. Nor does it change the nature of any beast; the same kind is born of each kind. (8) And if a different kind of body is never born from a body, how much more does a human soul not migrate into a different body?

55,9 And why is the body changed, does he say? So that, if it did not have the knowledge of the truth while it was in a man, it will be born in a dog or horse and disciplined[254] and return to a human body knowing the truth, (10) and be taken up into the moon's orb now that it has come to knowledge. And it is amazing to see that the soul was ignorant when it was born in a man although men have schools, grammarians, sophists, innumerable trades, and speech, hearing, and reason—but rather, it came to knowledge when it was born in a pig! This shows that, if anything, Mani's promise of knowledge is for pigs, because of his imposture and impiety.

56,1 As to Adam's creation, Mani gives a substitute version and interweaves it with error. He says that the person who said, "Let us make man in our image and after our likeness,"[255] < is the archon, who said it to the other archons* >. And Mani adds to this by saying, "*Come,* let us make man," which is not the text, but, "*Let us* make man in our image and after our likeness."

56,2 But the holy apostle refutes him by saying, < "The man is the image and glory of God."* >[256] So does the Lord himself, in the Gospel. The Pharisees told him that it is not good for a man to be by himself, and that Moses said he should give his wife a certificate of divorce and dismiss her. (3) And the Lord said to confute the Pharisees, "Moses wrote because of the hardness of your hearts. But from the beginning it was not so,[257] but

---

254 A long passage at Keph. 249,1–250,30 explains that, if catechumens are not perfected, their souls undergo transmigration as a remedial discipline.

255 Gen 1:26.

256 Holl assumes that the citation which has fallen out here is 1 Cor. 11:7.

257 Matt 19:8.

he which made them male and female"—and he said, "For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother and cleave unto his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh." (4) And he immediately adds, "What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder,"[258] confessing that God, that is, his Father, had made Adam and Eve, and that lawful wedlock has been instituted by him.

56,5 And the holy apostle, the herald of the truth, says in the same vein, 'This is a great mystery, but I say it of Christ and the church,"[259] using the comparison < to confirm the truth of* > God's creation of Adam and Eve* >—(6) < and confirm at the same time* > that God created < Eve* > and that Adam said, "This is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh, therefore shall a man leave,"[260] < and so forth >. And God shaped his side into a wife for him. (7) And < the apostle says nothing else on the subject >[261] that is different, but [simply], "It is a great mystery." And if < the apostle confirms the divine creation* > in the man and the woman and this is treated anagogically in an allegory, why does Mani, speaking blasphemy and ignoring the truth, suppose that God's creatures are abominable and foreign to God's truth, and < say that they were made* > by an archon?

56,8 Next, he says, because the soul which had been torn away at the beginning was a source of distress to the power on high it sent someone, one time, and, through these luminaries, stole the remnant of itself—the soul, that is—from the archons. (9) What high hopes we have, and what a great expectation! God the good, living and mighty is powerless to save—never mind his own power which has been dragged away from him—he can't save the creature he has made and fashioned! He can't save it except in some other way, or by the banditry of secretly stealing the power that has been torn away from him out of the heavens—or so the tramp says.

57,1 But why am I still tiring myself by spending time on his absurdity in its exact wording? For instance, neither is the wretch ashamed to say blasphemously that the one who spoke in the Law and the Prophets was the archon of darkness. (2) How blessed our hopes are, since Christ came and compelled us to offer gifts to the archon of darkness! For after cleansing the leper < he commands > him to offer the gift which is prescribed in the Law by the very person who spoke in the Law. "Go and offer thy gift

[258] Matt 19:5–6.
[259] Eph 5:32.
[260] Gen 2:23–24.
[261] Holl οὐκέτι ἕτερον ὁ ἀπόστολος εἰς αὐτὸ φάσκει, MSS οὐκέτι ἕτερον αὐτῷ φάσκει.

as Moses commanded,"[262] says he to the leper he has cleansed. (3) In the case of leprosy the "gift" was a bird for a sacrifice, and fine flour for a burnt offering. (4) If the archon of darkness were < the God of the Law* >, the Word who came from on high—the Son of God who, as Mani says, came to turn humankind from the error of the archons—would not encourage the leper he had healed to become their subject. He would encourage him to escape instead, by teaching him not to do this.

57,5 But he had not come to destroy the Law or < the > Prophets—he had given the Law himself—but to fulfill them, to show us himself that unwavering adherence to the Gospel is the fulfillment of the Law and the Prophets. For the prophets worshiped the same God, and the Law was given by him. Today, however, the worship is not offered to the same God with the same gifts; (6) God gave burdensome commands, as though to slaves, to the men of the Law, since in that way they would be able to obey. But to the men of the Gospel he gave lighter commands as though to free men, of the abundance of his loving kindness. (7) But since the God of the Law and the God of the Gospel are equivalent, and the worship of neither era has been abolished, this same God is one God, ruler of the entire world, worshiped by his servants—but worshiped in each generation as befits his loving kindness.

57,8 And Mani's imposture is altogether refuted, since the Savior orders that the Law's commandments be kept. And [then], after ordering the keeping of the Law's commandments, he breaks the Law's commandments, not by destroying them but by fulfilling them. For in place of the Law's commandments he orders that other sacrifices be offered to God, that is, those of piety, goodness, purity and ascetic discipline.

58,1 But again, Mani claims that in the last days the Elder will come and make his image manifest; and then, when he sees his face, the porter will drop the earth and the eternal fire will consume the earth. (2) Without noticing it the oaf was once again making the earth material, although he had said a while before that it was created by the Spirit of life. For simultaneously with this he supposes that the whole world will be consumed by fire.

58,3 And then, he says, after this, the restoration to unity of the two natures will pass on to the original condition. What a lot of trouble, and after the trouble nothing contributing to improvement! (4) For if everything is to be used up and consumed after it has been created and has

[262] Luke 5:14.

come into being, so that the originals of the two natures, the good and the evil, will remain as they were, this will again be a provocation for the evil nature to come back, start a war and seize some more power, so that another world will once more be generated.

58,5 But if this is not yet the case, then evil is going to learn sense and not be provoked at goodness any more; and [so is] the evil god, who will declare no more wars on the good God. (6) But if indeed he will ever be taught sense he will no longer be evil, since after his alteration he has been changed from his original evil nature. But if indeed the evil god's nature is at all changeable, this is surely because it gets changed from evil to good. And the nature which can be changed to goodness cannot be evil. For evil can be changed to good even today, and while the world is still going on. (7) And if he is to be changed, why is he not changed already? And if the evil god is changed by God's contrivance so that he can no longer do evil, the evil god cannot be responsible for himself. The responsibility must lie with the good God, since he is capable of suppressing the bad god's evil but will not to do before its time a work whose time has been fixed.

58,8 However, if evil is altogether unchangeable it can never stop warring and being warred on, and there can never be a restoration of the two natures. Evil will remain unchanged, and be provoked into doing evil to the good and declaring war on goodness.

58,9 And yet, if evil is always troubled by some desire for the good, it cannot be evil.[263] In its yearning for the good it desires to draw the good to itself, so that, by acquiring power from the nature of the good and its armor, it can feel it is honoring, illuminating, emboldening and strengthening itself. (10) For < the* > notion < of the good* > is surely present in anyone who wants the good, because he expects[264] to be benefited* > by good < itself* >. And evil cannot be altogether evil since it is found to be yearning for the good. For anything evil is hostile to the good, just as the good has no desire for evil.

58,11 But if the power is made of both principles jumbled together, and the good God can steal what belongs to him, and can attack the principalities and authorities and flay them—can sometimes destroy and do away with the matter made by the evil god, sometimes make things from it but sometimes do away with it—then < there can be no difference between

263 A similar argument is found at Alex. Lycop. 9 and Tit. Bost. Man. 1.17.

264 Holl < αὐτοῦ ὠφελήσασθαι > ὑπονοεῖ, < ἢ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ >, MSS ἀγαθοῦ ὑπονοίας ἔγκειται διάνοια.

good* > and evil. And< the > stream of chatter the offender has inflicted on us < will be found to be > wickedness, and incapable of proof.

59,1 Come on, buddy, speak up! Take up your account of the nature of evil again and tell us–you who arrived in the Emperor Aurelian's time, and yet are describing what was before all ages, though no prophet ever foretold this, and neither the Savior himself nor any of the apostles taught it. Unless you play the fool by writing yourself and palming off some forged books in the names of saints.[265] Tell us where you come from, you with your primordial principle of evil!

59,2 If I ask him whether he claims that this principle is changeable or unchangeable, < he talks incoherent nonsense* >. But I have already been told that he describes it [both] as [altogether] changeless, and as changeable at some times but not changeable at others—[that is], not changeable to evil but changeable to good—so that he earns the world's contempt with the two statements. (3) For if evil was changeless over immense ages, and had only this very name and no other name but "evil," who changed the changeless nature of evil many ages later, into something which was not suitable to it?

59,4 For who made it change, if it had not yet seized power and gone to war, and if it had not yet taken armor to strengthen itself and for food, but had gone for many ages without food or the need of food—[who made] this thing that had never needed food begin to eat, seek what it had never sought, need what it had never needed?

59,5 But if it was changed in nature, what proof can there be of the changelessness of evil that you teach? And even if he reverted to his normal condition when he found nothing more to eat, how could a wicked or evil [god] bear to go on without food for all time to come, once he had become used to eating and having food? (6) For if, when he was not used to eating, he could not bear it, but acquired the new habit of eating and got the soul for his food by stealing it, he will be the more ungovernable when he is used to foods. And once he has become greedy and acquainted with food, nothing could induce him to go on without these things, as your unprovable claim would have it.

60,1 But I shall pass this by, and once more extend the discussion to other parts of his nonsense. Once again, he claims that the archons will be in their own territory then, (i.e., at the restoration) and the Father will

---

[265] I.e., the Acts of Thomas. Cf. Aug. C. Faust. 27.9; Adim. 17.2.5; Serm. Dom. Mont. 1.20.65; Cyr. Cat 4.36; 6.31.

regain his own. (2) Now who is this person so equitable that he can survey the boundary of each territory from either side? Why will [the bad god] heed [him] when he did not heed the truth and the good God at the outset? If it is by force that the good God is to prevail on the lawbreaker to be content with his own and not encroach on the good God's portion, why couldn't he do this in the first place, before the area was stolen at all?

60,3 But why will the two co-exist, each with his respective possessions? If God has any territory, and the other territory is not his, the Almighty cannot be called almighty or God of all. Nor can the evil god be subject to the good God; each one has his own realm.[266]

60,4 But then, of what can the evil god be the master, when there is still no world, and no animals or people under his sway? And if he is evil at all, and matter and corruption, why hasn't he decayed? If evil has always been corruption, and corrupts other things but not itself, it cannot be in decay—not when it corrupts other things, but is perennial [itself] and does not disappear. (5) But if it remains stable itself, but corrupts other things and not itself, it cannot leave anything unaffected; the corruption of some things must surely corrupt others. But if it is the < only* > thing < left* > in existence, and it will no longer leave anything untouched but only it will remain, the things that are corrupted by it must disappear. (6) However, if it is also bad for itself and the cause of its own decay, its existence cannot continue. I should not say only in the future; it would disappear < as soon as > it was in being, and would in itself already be the cause of its own decay and disappearance.

60,7 But all these are the yarns of the fool's nonsense. Take note of them, you wise sons of God's holy church and the Lord's faith, judge the tramp, and laugh at his drivel! But he will go back to the misconceived occasions of it and resemblances to it in the sacred scriptures—< false ones* > which do not bear that interpretation, but are misunderstood by him in that sense. (8) All right, let's give the exact words of the texts which, as I said, he steals from the sacred scriptures and explains in his own way—though I have often discussed the same ones < already >, and refuted them perfectly well.

61,1 In the first place, because he had found something about the name "Paraclete" in the sacred scriptures and did not know the power of the Holy Spirit, he smuggled himself into them, thinking that this was what they meant. (2) And he claims that what St. Paul said leaves room for

[266] A comparable argument is found at Tit. Bost. Man. 1:30.

him, since the holy apostle said, "We know in part and we prophesy in part; but when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away."[267]

61,3 But St. Paul never says this of the Paraclete, though he, with those who like him were apostles, was counted worthy of the Holy Spirit himself. He was talking about the two worlds, this world and the world to come, as he told those who want < prior > knowledge of the times, "Let no man affright you by word < or > by letter, as that the day of the Lord is at hand. For except the son of sin be revealed, the man of iniquity,"[268] and so on . . .(a citation is missing here)

61,4 And again, when the disciples had met with the Savior and asked him about the consummation, and he told them, "It is not for you to know the times and the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power. But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you."[269] (5) And again he said, "Depart not from Jerusalem, while ye await the promise of the Spirit, which ye have heard."[270] This means the Paraclete Spirit, as he said, "If I depart, he shall come and shew you all things."[271] (6) But < he said* >, "He shall show you all things," because of the gift that was to be vouchsafed them; < for* > the Holy Spirit < would* > dwell in them to give them a clear explanation of all that they could understand in this world.

61,7 And as vessels of the Paraclete Spirit, they prophesied here in this world, as < the scripture says > that Agabus prophesied an impending famine, and that "Prophets came down from Jerusalem,"[272] and that "Philip had four daughters which did prophesy."[273]

61,8 But when these prophets prophesy, they prophesy in part and know in part but with hope await what is perfect in the ages to come, "when the corruptible is changed to incorruption and the mortal to immortality."[274] For < "When this mortal shall have put on immortality, >[275] then shall we see face to face." (9) For now these things are shown to us

---

[267] 1 Cor 13:9–10. Mani is said to use this argument, Act. Arch. 15.3; cf. Aug. C. Faust. 15.6; 32.17; Fel. 1.9.

[268] 2 Thes 2:2–3.

[269] Acts 1:7–8.

[270] Acts 1:4.

[271] Cf. John 16:7; 13–15.

[272] Acts 11:27.

[273] Acts 21:9.

[274] 1 Cor 15:53.

[275] MSS ὅταν τότε; Holl· ὅταν . . . τότε γὰρ βλέπομεν. We adopt Dummer's suggestion, which follows Diekamp, that Epiphanius quoted 1 Cor 15:54 after ὅταν.

"darkly,"[276] but there "what eye hath not seen here" is prepared. There perfection is revealed, those things that "ear hath not heard" here. There is the greatest gift to the saints, that which "hath not entered into the heart of man"[277] here.

61,10 And you see that no further knowledge was held in reserve for Mani. How could Mani know it when < he > fell short of his own goal? He undertook to master Marcellus; he came to Archelaus with the intent of defeating him and could not. (11) Since he has no knowledge of recent events, how can he have it of the greater things? When he was caught and punished, for example, why did he not escape from the king of Persia—except to show all sensible people that he was a complete liar?

62,1 Again, he cites a text in vain to prove the existence of the dyad he believes in and distinguish between the two first principles: the Savior's words, "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit; for by its fruit the tree is known."[278] (2) And note his shallow mind, which does not understand the contents of sacred scripture in any depth! If there are trees they have a cultivator; trees are plants and have surely been planted by someone. And nothing which is planted is beginningless but has a beginning. And having a beginning, it will have an end as well. (3) The corrupt tree was not always there, then, but had been planted. And this "good tree" is not a reference to all the goodness on high—for < there is* > goodness unfeigned there, changeless, of ineffable dignity—< and* > the thought is < not about* > the true holy God.

62,4 But let's see whether Mani is right about the business of trees, and take it from there. If we are talking about the devil, I have already shown often that he was not created evil; God made nothing evil, and this is plain to the wise. (5) For if we are going over the same ground, it will do no harm to give an account of the truth even now. The devil was not wicked in the beginning; he proved to be wicked. Look here, the point about the tree won't be proved from that angle!

62,6 We see too that Saul was a persecutor, but was later persecuted for the name he once persecuted. We see that Judas was chosen with the twelve apostles but later proved to be < evil >, and is counted as evil. (7) We see that Rahab the harlot was not of Israelite stock, but that she repented later and received God's mercy. We see that the thief was apprehended in

---

[276] 1 Cor 13:12.

[277] 1 Cor 2:9.

[278] Matt 7:18; 20. Keph. 17,1–23,13 treats this as the fundamental principle of Manicheaism. Cf. Aug. Fel. 2.2.

a crime and hanged on the wood, and yet he confessed and has entered Paradise with the Lord. We see that Nicolaus was a good man and had been chosen—but that he proved to be evil afterwards and was reckoned among the heresiarchs.

62,8 And why give all these examples? What is this evil tree from which no good can come? Plainly,[279] it is the acts of human beings. Nothing good can come of fornication, no righteousness of the wickedness of envy,[280] nothing commendable of adultery. (9) The tree of sin itself cannot grow through goodness—that is, an evil tree does not bear good fruit, nor < can > the fruit of a good tree < be > evil. (10) The good tree which does not bear evil fruit < is the human heart which is firmly established in God and from which, like good fruit, there spring such good works* > as hospitality, < which is never evil* >. Even if any number of < evils > result from hospitality, charity does not for < this > reason have the force of wickedness. [Nor does] purity for God's sake, continence for the Lord's, righteousness for the Law's.

62,11 These two trees are figurative expressions for righteousness and sin; but in this barbarous Mani's opinion, [one] means God and [the other] means the devil. (12) And yet, it is plain that no one can dare to say that God will ever create evil—perish the thought!—or that the devil does good. (13) All good things are made by God, and nothing evil has been created or made by him. But if certain things are the work of the devil, see here, < in this case too we have found that God fights on the side of the faithful* >, that a wreath is woven by him for the saints, the victors awarded a prize.[281] (14) And Mani's argument has failed. The evil and good trees refer to good and evil works and not to the Old and the New Testaments, as Mani's argument maintains.

63,1 Moreover, from a desire to furnish occasions of the two first principles, he ferrets out and employs the texts he thinks apply, though they do < not > have this meaning. He says that the Savior told the Jews, "Ye are sons of the devil; he was a murderer because his father was a liar."[282] (2) He wants to say blasphemously that the maker of heaven and earth is the father of the devil, although the text cannot possibly refer to this.

---

[279] Holl δηλόν, MSS πάλιν.

[280] φθόνου πονηρίας. Dummer, following Drexl, suggests that one of these nouns should be omitted.

[281] This is probably a reference to martyrdom, which is often regarded as combat with the devil. See, e.g., Cyprian of Carthage, Treatise 11.2; in NHC, Apocry. Jas. 4,32–36, etc.

[282] Cf. John 8:44.

63,3 For if the Jews are in any sense sons of the devil, the argument about the devil has failed and Mani is unwittingly contradicting himself. For if their souls are made by the devil it follows that they are distinct [from the others] and cannot originate from Mani's mythical power on high, or be a part of the light or its armor, or the pillar of light, or the Mother of Light. (4) But if < they are > in any sense the devil's children, it follows from Mani's argument that their father Abraham, whose offspring the Jews are, is the devil's son too.

63,5 Well then, why does the Savior say to them in refutation, "Ye are no children of Abraham, but children of your father, the devil. If ye were children of Abraham, ye would do his works. For ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth. This did not Abraham."[283] (6) And you can see that this is colloquial language. The Jews are Abraham's children, and yet separate themselves from the Lord by their works, not their nature or creation—I have previously discussed this.[284] How can the portion of Abraham's descendants at one moment be alien to him and belong to the devil, and at the next be God's portion? (7) The Savior means this as an accusation. By his activity and his teaching a man is the slave of the one to whom he submits, as Paul says, "Though ye have many instructors, yet have ye not many fathers. For in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the Gospel."[285] (8) And do you see that he means teaching? And if Mani accepted Abraham, we would say that Abraham was the son of the God of light, but that his children were someone else's!

63,9 But this is the reason. The Jews were imitating the murderer, imitating the betrayal of Judas, had hearkened to the slander of the betrayer, become the children of his denial of God. He himself was a liar, for he "had the bag and stole,"[286] and said, "Hail, master," to the Savior, and heard his reproach, "Friend, wherefore art thou come?"[287] (10) Since he had become a murderer this Judas imitated Cain who lied to the Lord's face and said "Am I my brother's keeper? I know not where he is."[288] And Cain himself had become the < devil's > son, by imitation and by paying

283 Cf. John 8:39–41.
284 Pan. 38,4,2–9; 40,5,5–8a; 6,1–8.
285 1 Cor 4:15.
286 John 12:6.
287 Matt 26:49–50.
288 Gen 4:9.

heed to the lying voice that spoke in the serpent and said, "Ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil."[289]

63,11 This is what the Savior says in the Gospel, "Ye are sons of the devil."[290] For he says, "Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?"[291] "Devil" because he was "a liar and a murderer from the beginning, for his father was a liar."[292]

63,12 And this question has been resolved. The Jews were not the devil's children, far from it! The Samaritan woman says to the Savior, "Here in this mountain our fathers worshiped; and ye say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship"—(13) and later, after much discussion, the Savior told her, "We speak that we do know, *for salvation is of the Jews*."[293] And the apostle said in his turn, "It is plain that the Lord sprang from *Judah*."[294] And there is a great deal to say about this in refutation of Mani's imposture.

64,1 Again, he seizes on the following text, "The light shineth in the darkness, and the darkness overcame it not."[295] This means that the darkness pursued the light, he says, since the evil archons pursued the Godhead and fought against it.

64,2 But if the light is under attack and pursued by the darkness, the darkness must be stronger than the light—since the light runs away from the darkness and cannot bear to make a stand, since darkness is apparently the stronger. (3) But that is not so. The light does not flee from the darkness, for "The light shineth in the darkness and the darkness overcame it not."[296] But if the darkness did not overcome the light, this is very different from what Mani means. He says not only that the darkness overcame the light, but that it seized armor from it as well. Now how ever could < the > darkness not overcome the light, when Mani declares that it has seized armor? However, if the light is being pursued, why does it willingly go on shining in the darkness?

64,4 But because men's minds had been blinded by the muddiness of sin, God sent the Law first, giving them light as when a lamp appears, (5) as Peter says in his Epistle, 'Taking heed unto the word of prophecy, as unto

---

289 Gen 3:5.
290 John 8:44.
291 John 6:70.
292 Cf. John 8:44.
293 John 4:20; 22; 3:11.
294 Heb 7:14.
295 John 1:5.
296 John 1:5; cf. Act. Arch. 27.11.

a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day star arise, and the day dawn in your hearts."[297] For that is the source of the light which shines in the darkness—the Law which was given "by the hand of a mediator,"[298] through God's faithful servant Moses.

64,6 Because the Law had always been shining like a spark in the law of nature, Enoch, saw it and pleased the Lord; Abel pleased the Lord by its guidance. Noah saw his way by it, and found favor before God; Abraham believed God by it and it was reckoned to him for righteousness. (7) Then the light overpassed the dimensions of a spark, and was added to the luster of "the lamp that shineth in a dark place." This is the meaning of "The light shineth in the darkness:"[299] God's commandment, and the intent of goodness, which gives light in the hearts of the faithful, within the mind muddied < by > the wicked things men do—idolatry, the denial of God, murders, adultery and the rest.

64,8 But when the great Light came, "the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world, he was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not—this light that came unto his own, and his own received him not—but as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God."[300] (9) And do you see in what sort of darkness this light shines, and what sort of darkness has not overcome it? For the good which is continually sent to the human mind by God, and which gives light in the world, has not been vanquished by sin.

65,1 Once more, Mani similarly seizes on the Savior's words, "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder, which sowed good seed < in > his field. And while men slept an enemy came and sowed tares. (2) Then his servants said unto him, Didst thou not sow good seed in the field? He said, Yea. They said, Whence then the tares? He said, An enemy hath done this. His servant said unto him, Wilt thou that we go and root the tares out? (3) But he said unto them, Nay, lest while rooting out the tares ye root out also the wheat. Leave them until the time of harvest, and I shall say to the reapers, Gather up the tares and burn them, but store the wheat in the barn, and make the tares ready to be burned with fire unquenchable."[301]

---

297 2 Pet 1:19.
298 Gal 3:19; Heb 3:5.
299 John 1:5.
300 John 1:9–12.
301 Cf. Matt 13:24–30 and Act. Arch. 15.7.

65,4 But when his disciples asked him in the house, 'Tell us the parable of the tares," he explained and did not conceal it, so as not to provide the cheat with an opening against the truth. (5) The Lord answered them plainly and said, "He that sowed the good seed is God. The field is the world; the tares are the wicked men; the enemy is the devil; the reapers are the angels; the harvest is the consummation of the age; the wheat is the good men. (6) < The consummation will come > when the Lord sendeth his angels and gathereth the sinners out of his kingdom and delivereth them to be burned."[302]

65,7 Sons of the truth, see that this man who has become our new version of Jannes and Jambres puts forth his own arguments against himself. He himself denies that the world is God's; yet the Savior has said here that the world is the field, that the householder and owner of the field < is God >—that is, his Father; and that it is he who has sown his good seed. (8) And he did not distinguish souls from bodies or bodies from souls, but said that the enemy had sown the tares, which are the evil men. And he does not call men just bodies < or just souls > but said, "evil men," [meaning both] together. (9) And in turn, he said likewise that the good men are the good seed < which > the householder sowed in his field. And he didn't say their souls, but "good < men >," with body and soul. (10) God thus sows the good in men by his teaching, and the devil secretly sows the evil deeds in men by his mischief.

65,11 But we are not going to find a root of wickedness in this place or that, but works done by ourselves. And God is in no way responsible for the tares which have been sown. Christ makes this clear at once by saying, "while men slept"; he didn't say, "while the householder slept." Whenever we doze off from good works, whenever we neglect righteousness, whenever we do not alert our minds to God's commandment, sins are sown < in us >.

65,12 Do you see that the reapers get the bundles ready for the eternal fire? Tell me, Mani, do they bind up souls there? Or do they burn bodies without souls, or burn the souls too? Your description of the purification of souls cannot stand up, because they will be consigned to punishment and condemnation. But so much for this. For the wise, the utterances of the truth are plain.

66,1 He seizes on yet another text and cites it without realizing its implications, but with a wrong interpretation of its saving teaching. I mean the

[302] Cf. Matt 13:36–42.

words of the Savior, 'The prince of this world cometh, and findeth nothing of his in me";[303] < and again, "The prince of this world shall be cast down >";[304] and again, in the apostle, 'The god of this world hath blinded the eyes of them that believe not, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ should shine."[305]

66,2 Let's see < whether > the ruler of this world, of whom the Lord speaks, will be cast down—for Christ adds, "And if I be lifted up, I will draw all men unto me."[306] Whom does he mean by "the ruler of this world?" And if he means the devil, why does John say of the Savior in his Gospel, "He came unto his own?"[307]

66,3 For we can see that the two following sayings are contradictory. The apostle says, 'The whole world lieth in the evil one,"[308] and yet the Savior "was in the world."[309] How can both of these allow for each other? And if the whole world lies in the evil one, where is there room in the world for the Savior, so that he can be "in the world?" (4) And if the world's contents are the Son of God's "own,"[310] what "ruler" exercises control over God's own? But if the contents of the world are not the Son of God's "own," what "ruler of the world" would allow the world's contents to be the Savior's own? And if the world is the Son of God's, why would he allow a "ruler" to hold his own world prisoner?

66,5 But all the words of the sacred scripture are spoken with wisdom, as the Lord himself says, "John came in the way of righteousness, neither eating nor drinking, and they say, He hath a devil. The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold, a man gluttonous and a winebibber, the friend of publicans and sinners. And wisdom is justified of her children."[311] (6) And how was wisdom justified by her children? How but by those who understand wisdom's words, as it also says in the prophet, "Who is wise, and he shall understand these things? For the ways

---

303 Cf. John 14:30.
304 Cf. John 12:31.
305 2 Cor 4:4. Cf. Man. Ps. 172,26–27, "He that ate the sheep is the devouring fire, the God of this aeon that led the world astray." The "god of this world" is identified with the "evil god" at Act. Arch. 175.7; cf. Aug. C. Faust. 20.1; C. Fel. 2.2.
306 John 12:32.
307 John 1:11.
308 Cf. 1 John 5:19.
309 John 1:10.
310 John 1:11.
311 Matt 11:18–19; cf. Luke 7:35.

of the Lord are right, and whoso hath the word of wisdom shall likewise understand these things; but the impious shall faint in them."[312]

67,1 < Mani > has indeed fainted in the sacred and heavenly words, and been impious with the impious. For the Savior said shortly before this, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven";[313] and here again, he says, "The ruler of this world shall be cast down."[314] (2) And if he was speaking of a Satan who had already fallen, why did he need to be cast down again?

But you will surely say, "[He had to be cast] into the abyss." All right, where was the Lord to be "lifted up?" If he was to be lifted from the abyss, < he needed to go there first. But he spoke while he was on earth, and was to be lifted up from there* >—< for > the comparison of like with like assures equivalence of expression.

67,3 But when was he lifted up on earth? He was speaking of his lifting on the cross, and his ascent to heaven to draw all to himself. (4) And why didn't he draw them while he was [still] in heaven, but came to earth instead? He had to come and assume the form of men, in order to < exalt > the holy vessel < in himself > first of all—[the holy vessel] he had taken from Mary and formed as his own holy body, the divine Word from on high, come from the bosom of his Father. Then, when he had been exalted in his own body, he could draw the persons who were like him to himself.

67,5 But who is the ruler of this world? When scripture says, "The whole world lieth in the evil one," it does not mean heaven, earth, the sun, the moon, vegetation, the sea, mountains, the air, clouds, the wind, stars, winged things—it does not mean any part of the creation, perish the thought! "The world" < is* > human < lust* >, the arrogance of the human mind, the insolence of human vanity, the boastfulness of human pride. (6) This, arrogance, was the "ruler of this world" who was cast down. For the Savior says, "Ye receive honor one of another, but I seek not mine own glory."[315]

67,7 How could arrogance not fall, how could the ruler of the world not be crushed, when Herod kept the Judge and Lord of the quick and dead under guard and judged him? When Pilate sat in judgment on him, a servant struck his jaw, Judas betrayed him, Caiaphas sentenced him, the Jews

---

312 Hos 14:10.
313 Luke 10:18.
314 John 12:31.
315 John 5:44; 8:50.

spat on him, and soldiers struck his head though he could have crushed heaven and earth with a nod? (8) This was the arrogance, insolence, and vainglory of the men of the world; this was the ruler of the world, who fell to the earth. For all the notables of rank exercise their authority by shouting, insolence, reputation and arrogance, none of which are to be found in the Savior. For "a smoking flax shall he not quench, and a bruised reed shall he not break."[316]

68,1 And I have a great deal to say about this. But once more, this same Mani says that "The god of this world hath blinded the minds of them that believe not, lest they should shine in the light of the Gospel."[317] (2) If there is any "god of this world," what was the Savior doing, entering someone else's territory? And if he coveted someone else's possessions, this is no way for a good or a just person to behave. (3) But if he came to save things which were not his but someone else's, this is the behavior of a flatterer whose object is to make his neighbor's slaves more impertinent than they are.

68,4 And if he did come to save the possessions of the god of this world, he was doing the favor for the god of this world himself, by trying to save his vessels. And if the god of this world assents in any way to the rescue of his property by the Savior then, even if he cannot save it himself, he is good, since he is pleased with the rescue of his possessions.

68,5 And then there will be a single mutuality of goodness. For the One who can, saves, while the one who cannot save his own is pleased with those who are saved, and feels that he gains by receiving his own, saved, from the One who can really save them. (6) And if he offers no opposition to the One who wants to save his possessions, he will be thankful too.

68,6 But if he is thankful to him, < the Savior > will first save the owner of the saved—to display his goodness in the rescued owner, and < because >he will not wish to save the less important persons and overlook the essential one, from whom the saved have their origin.

68,7 Or again, from another viewpoint: If he prefers not to save him (i.e., the god of the world) and yet saves < the persons > he < has made >, he is not finishing his task, and is unable to do good in the fullest sense of the word. But if he cannot save him because his is of a nature which is unsaveable, but still saves the persons he made—if anything, the ones he made are worse than he, and incapable of salvation.

316 Isa 42:3.
317 Cf. 2 Cor 4:4.

68,8 But to put it in still another way: If he had no possessions of his own to save and came to someone else's for show, < to > make a display of his assistance—what a desperate plight, that cannot save anything of its own, and goes to foreign territory to show off the act which it could not show in its own!

68,9 And Mani's argument about the Savior and the ruler of this world has failed already. In fact the "god of this world" cannot be another god different from the real one, or a real other god, perish the thought! God the Lord of all, the maker of the world, is one God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and never fails.

69,1 As to the god the apostle says the unbelievers have chosen for their god—I say that there is not just one "god of this world," never think it, there are many. To them unbelievers have submitted and been blinded in mind as the apostle says in another passage, (2) "whose god is their belly and whose glory is in their shame."[318] And the Lord says in the Gospel, "Ye cannot serve two masters"; and then a good while later, to show who the two masters are, says, "Ye cannot serve God and mammon."[319]

69,3 Very well, "God" is God, and mammon is "the god of this world." For most of the human race is caught by mammon and the belly, these two, and goes blind, not at God's instigation but by their own malice—for out of unbelief everyone desires everything and submits to everything. (4) Thus the apostle says, "The love of money is the root of all evil."[320] And he curses their wicked propensity for god-making for this reason, and to curse the lusts of the belly says, "Meats for the belly, and the belly for meats; but God shall destroy both it and them."[321]

69,5 The god of this world, then, has blinded the minds of the unbelievers. Thus in the Gospel too we find that the scribe first[322] says correctly, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?"[323] And the Lord said, "Honor thy father and thy mother as it is written." For the commandments of the Law were not foreign to him, and thus the Lord himself teaches that observance of the Law is inheritance of eternal life.

69,6 Then the scribe says, "All these things have I done from my youth." And on hearing this the Lord "rejoiced," to show that the Law's

---

318 Phil 3:19.
319 Matt 6:24.
320 1 Tim 6:10.
321 1 Cor 6:13.
322 Holl πρῶτον καλῶς, MSS πρῶτος καὶ δεύτερος.
323 For this and the next citation cf. Matt 19:20–26.

commandments are not foreign to his Godhead; for by saying that he "rejoiced," scripture expressed the agreement of the Old Testament with the New Testament.

69,7 But the scribe said, "What lack I yet?"[324] and the Lord told him, "If thou wilt be perfect sell that thou hast and give to the poor, and take up thy cross and follow me, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven. But he went away sorrowing, for he was very rich."[325] Then the Lord said, "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven."[326] < The rich > cannot enter because they have been blinded by the god of this world, and have taken mammon for their god and submitted to the "god of this world," that is, to covetousness. (9) As Christ says, "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy,"[327] and elsewhere, "which is covetousness."[328]

And to show the effect and consequence of covetousness he says, "They be blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch."[329] (10) For since covetousness, the god of this world, had blinded them, neither had "The light of the Gospel shone in their hearts,"[330] for they had gone blind from covetousness. (11) Covetousness also blinded Judas, also killed Ananias and Sapphira, has destroyed many. This is "the god of this world." By their choice of him for their god men have taken to the honoring of him and despised the Lord, as he says, "He will hold to the one and despise the other; ye cannot serve God and mammon."[331]

69,12 And there you see the literal and plain explanation of the matter. There cannot be any other god, not in heaven, not on earth, not anywhere. "There is one Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things,"[332] and one Holy Spirit, in whom are all things. The Trinity is forever, one Godhead, neither receiving addition nor admitting of subtraction.

70,1 Let us go on again to something else, beloved, and rend the nets of this beast, enemy and criminal by comparing his heresies with the speech of the truth, for the benefit of those whose aim is to learn the truth and

---

[324] Cf. Matt 19:20–22.
[325] Luke 18:23.
[326] Matt 19:24.
[327] Luke 12:1.
[328] This is a variant reading of Luke 12:1.
[329] Matt 15:14.
[330] Cf. 2 Cor 4:4.
[331] Matt 6:24.
[332] 1 Cor 8:3.

turn their minds away from the erring teaching of every sect. (2) For once more he seizes on the Law and the Prophets, though he is the enemy of the truth, and of the Holy Spirit who has spoken in the Law and the Prophets. Naturally he has, as always, given his tongue free rein against the God who made all things and spoke in the Law and the Prophets, "the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom all the family in heaven and earth is named."[333]

70,3 Mani says, "From him (i.e., the God of the Law) comes lust, from him come murders and all the rest. For he ordered [the Jews] to take the Egyptians' clothing and that sacrifices be offered to him, and the rest of the Law's provisions—and the murder of the murderer, so that he is still not satisfied with the first murder,[334] but even commands a second supposedly to avenge the first. And he puts lusts into people's minds by his descriptions < of > women and other things; but he perforce made a few prophecies of Christ, to establish his credibility by these few plausible remarks."

70,4 And these were the words of the insolent Mani, which he impudently utters against his own Master. Observing them, one must see that there is nothing but delirium in this man. For as someone in delirium who has a sword draws his sword against himself, cuts his own flesh in his fit in the belief that he is fighting against enemies, and does not know it, so Mani is at war with himself because he does not understand the texts he applies against himself. (5) For if lust is from God and he is the cause of lust, why does the God who puts lust in people's heads write against lust all over the scriptures? It is he who says, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods, nor his ox nor his ass nor his maidservant nor his field nor his wife, nor anything that is thy neighbor's."[335] If he forbids lust, he cannot be the provider of lust.

71,1 Why, asks Mani, did he order the spoiling of the Egyptians when the Israelites went out of Egypt? Yes, he did—for he is a just judge, as I have often said of him by now. (2) And to show that he himself has no need of sacrifices, he says in the prophet, "Have ye offered unto me sacrifices forty years, O house of Israel? saith the Lord."[336] (3) To whom were the < sacrifices > offered, then? To him, in proportion with the understanding of the offerers; and God had commanded this, not because he needed the

[333] Eph 3:15.
[334] Cf. Act. Arch. 44.8.
[335] Exod 20:17.
[336] Amos 5:25.

sacrifices, but to wean them away from polytheism to the recognition of one God. [He commanded it] because they had seen sacrifices offered to the gods of the Egyptians, so that their minds would not be changed because of the polytheism, and they would desert the one and only God. (4) But when God had dissuaded them from polytheism over a long period of time and weaned them away from an opinion of this sort, he began to cut off the things that were not his will, and said, To what purpose bring ye me incense from Saba, and spices from a land afar off?"[337] "Will I eat the flesh of bulls and drink the blood of goats?"[338] "I have not required this at your hands,"[339] "but to do righteousness each man to his neighbor, and truth each man to his brother."[340]

71,5 And you see that the meaning behind the sacred < oracles > is revealed as time goes on. For example, God himself tells Samuel, "Anoint Saul as king,"[341] but later he accuses them with the words, "Ye have anointed a king but not by me, and rulers, and I did not command you."[342] (6) And since their minds were set on this, God consoles[343] the prophet Samuel by saying, "They have not rejected thee, but me, saith the Lord. But anoint for them Saul, the son of Kish." The Godhead was dealing with them as though with little children, to show patience with the feebleness of the weak and coax the infant out of its weakness. (7) Then, at the very last, he says, "The sacrifice of God is a broken spirit; a broken and contrite heart God will not despise,"[344] "Offer unto God the sacrifice of praise,"[345] and whatever other things can be said about this.

72,1 Next this same Mani says that < the God who gave the Law perforce* > consented to say something about Christ. < And the cheat does not see how he is confuting himself* >. (2) For if he knows the future he is not devoid of foreknowledge—but the one who knows the events of the future is God, and he wrote of them in order that they would take place. And if they were repugnant to him he wrote of them but forbade them, so that we would not consent to them. (3) But since he guarantees that those future events will be realized in Christ, the Spirit who spoke in the

337 Jer 6:20.
338 Ps 49:13.
339 Isa 1:12.
340 Cf. Zech 8:16.
341 Cf. 1 Kms 9:16.
342 Cf. Hos 8:10.
343 Cf. 1 Kms 8:7; 22.
344 Ps 50:19.
345 Ps 49:14.

Law and the Prophets, and in the Gospel, is the same. For there is one concord as God says through Moses, "The Lord shall raise up unto you a prophet, from your brethren, < like unto me >"[346] (4) and the Lord in his turn says in the Gospel, "Moses wrote of me."[347] Moses says, "Every soul that shall not hearken unto that prophet, shall be destroyed,"[348] and the Lord, in turn, says, "If ye believe not Moses' writings, how shall ye believe my words?"[349] And it is plain on every side that the truth is a shining thing and "has no spot."[350]

73,1 Again, Mani declares that the testament of the Law is the testament of death, since the apostle has said, "If the testament of death, graven with letters on stones, was given with glory."[351] (2) And the sacred scripture said not only this, but, "The Law is not made for a righteous man, but for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for perjured persons, and if there be anything that is contrary to sound doctrine."[352] (3) Now because the Law is not made for a righteous man, is the righteous man therefore a law-breaker? Of course not! But since the righteous man has already obeyed the Law's commandments, there is no Law against a righteous keeper of the Law; the Law is against the lawless, and condemns law-breakers.

73,4 In this way, then, the testament was a < testament of death >. It said that the murderer should be murdered, the adulterer put to death, the law-breaker stoned. But "It came with glory," for its glory was great. It prevailed over the glory men derive from injustice to one another, and it was typified by the light of a pillar of fire [and] fearful trumpets with their loud blasts, < it was deposited* > in the tent of meeting, and came at that time with great glory.

73,5 For the testament of death had to come first, so that we would "die to sin" first and "live to righteousness"[353]—as Christ "hath borne our griefs and carried our infirmities,"[354] "bearing all in his body on the

346 Deut 18:15.
347 John 5:46.
348 Cf. Deut 18:19.
349 John 5:47.
350 Eph 5:27.
351 Cf. 2 Cor 3:7; Act. Arch. 15.12; 32.4.
352 1 Tim 1:9–10.
353 Cf. 1 Pet 2:24.
354 Isa 53:4.

cross,"[355] so that first everything pertaining to death and then everything pertaining to life would be fulfilled in him for our sakes.

73,6 And this is why he died first, to confirm the testament of death. Then he rose from the dead, that < we might be "changed > from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord."[356] For "He triumphed over principalities and powers"[357] on the cross and "condemned sin"[358] in death. He buried iniquity by his burial, and broke "death's sting"[359] by tasting death. By his descent into hades he despoiled hades, manfully loosed its prisoners, and won the trophy of the cross against the devil.

73,7 And see how this glory is the same from Moses until the Lord! How much more should the testament of life be glorious, when a stone has been rolled away, rocks are rent, graves are opened, angels shine like lightning, women proclaim the good tidings, peace is bestowed, a Spirit is given the apostles by the Lord, a kingdom of heaven is proclaimed, and a Gospel has enlightened the world? "He that descended is the same as he that ascended far above all heavens,"[360] (8) and sits at the Father's right hand. The testament was not a bringer of death, it was a testament against death. The testament of death came with glory so that the glory that excelled it might be [a testament] against death.

74,1 The next thing this same Mani says is, "The Old and New Testaments cannot be those of one teacher. For the one is growing older day after day, while the other is being renewed day by day. For everything that grows old and ages is nearing disappearance. The former is the testament of one God and one teacher, the latter, of a different God and a different teacher."[361]

74,2 Now what he says might carry conviction if he were able to show that there are two Old Testaments, on the supposition that there were two testaments given then. And similarly, if he could show two New Testaments, one could take what he has said to heart.[362] (3) But if the Old Testament is one God's and the New Testament is another's, and the New Testament is the testament of a good God while the Old is that of a bad one, the good God would not have known that he should give a testament

355 1 Pet 2:24.
356 2 Cor 3:10.
357 Col 2:15.
358 Rom 8:3.
359 1 Cor 15:55–56.
360 Eph 4:10.
361 Cf. Act. Arch. 15.12.
362 Cf. Act. Arch. 52.2.

if he had not seen the bad god giving one. And if anything, he would be taking the occasion for his teaching from the bad god. For if he had not seen the bad god giving a testament he would not have imitated him, since he had no experience of affairs. For if he had not seen, he would not have imitated. (4) And, if anything, the Old Testament ought to be the good God's so that, if someone must be called an imitator, it is the bad god rather than the actual God.

74,5 For the Lord says in the Gospel, "What things soever the Son seeth the Father do, the Son likewise doeth."[363] And [he says this] to avoid deferring to a counselor, lest the devil boast that the Savior has done something by his advice—as the devil tells him, "Command that the stones be made bread,"[364] but he will not hear of it so as not to be suspected, from his agreement, of taking the advice from the devil.

74,6 And do you see that he says that the two testaments are those of one God? The apostle says, "The first testament was given at Mt. Sinai and gendereth to bondage. For Mt. Sinai is in Arabia. < But the heavenly Jerusalem is free, which is the mother of us all >."[365] For if there are two wives, there is still only one husband. thus, even though there are two Testaments, there is one God, the giver of the two. (7) And this is why he did not call two testaments "New," or two testaments "Old," but called one Old and one New. And he says, "A testament is of force after men are dead; therefore the first testament was not dedicated without blood. For Moses took the blood of goats and sprinkled both the book and the people."[366] Thus the second testament too was given at the death of the Savior. (8) And above all, both Testaments are in agreement. The one says, "There shall not fail a ruler from Judah, nor a governor from out of his loins, until that come for which it is prepared";[367] but the second says, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them."[368] And there is a great deal to be said about this, but for brevity's sake I shall omit it.

75,1 And again, he compares the Law and the Prophets to trees which are withered and old, supposedly taking this from the text which said,

---

[363] John 5:19.
[364] Matt 4:3.
[365] Gal 4:24–26.
[366] Heb 9:17; 18; 19.
[367] Gen 49:10.
[368] 2 Cor 5:19.

"The Law and the Prophets were until John."[369] (2) And nothing could be sillier. Who does not understand that once < the Law > which the prophets proclaimed was fulfilled, the prophets were finished? If prophets were still coming and announcing a Christ to come from Mary, Christ would not have arrived yet.

75,3 For this matter is something of this kind:[370] It is as though a king who intends to visit a country sends riders, advance men and heralds before him, and the nearer the king's arrival the more heralds there are of his coming, preceding him and proclaiming his arrival in the cities. (4) But when the king actually reaches the city, what further need is there for heralds, what for riders, or for the others to proclaim the king's arrival in advance, since the king himself is in the city?

75,5 And thus "The Law and the prophets were until John."[371] After John had cried aloud in the wilderness and made it known that "This is the lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world,"[372] there was no more need for prophets, to come and announce to us Christ's advent from a Virgin. But there was the need of those who had previously proclaimed his coming in the past, for the confirmation of his coming, since it had been proclaimed before.

75,6 It is as though someone had a pedagogue, as the apostle says, "The Law was our pedagogue until the Lord's coming."[373] When the person grows old enough and obtains a teacher, he surely does not get rid of the pedagogue as though he were an enemy. (7) So we too were given guidance in the Law and the Prophets until the coming of our Teacher. But now that we have our teacher we do not despise the pedagogue but, indeed, are grateful to him. He has served as the guide of our childhood, and set us on our way to the more advanced studies.

75,8 Or, it is as though a man planning to make a sea voyage had a big ship, but sailed over the open roadstead beside the shore in a little boat, and the boat took the man to the big ship. The man surely does not sink the boat because he has reached the big ship, but boards his larger, safe ship with thanks to the boat. (9) Or to put it another way, suppose one were exposed in infancy by the mother who bore him, but taken in by a passerby and reared for some time, and recognized his real father

369 Luke 16:16. Cf. Act. Arch. 15.14.
370 The following series of metaphors may have been suggested by Act. Arch. 15.14.
371 Luke 16:16.
372 John 1:29.
373 Gal 3:24.

later when he grew up, and his father acknowledged him. Does he despise the man who brought him up because he has recognized his father and is getting his own inheritance? Won't he far sooner thank the man who brought him up, because he did not leave him to die? (10) In the same way, we thank the God who has given us the Law and the Prophets, and we thank him < who > has counted us worthy of his Son's New Testament.

76,1 Once more, Mani says that we are kinds of archons, that we were made by the archons,[374] and that we are held in reserve for them, for food. But there is a great deal of ignorance in this sort of talk; (2) we can see that this is not the way things are. Nothing in the world, not even if it is one of < the > more dangerous, fiercer beasts, attacks its own kind, but other kinds. (3) Lions do not eat lions, for example, because they are of the same stamp and the same kind. Even when a severe famine bears hard upon the beasts in the mountains, and they find no < food > for a long while because of snow or some other exigency, they live in their caves and dens, lions with cubs and lionesses, < and do not touch each other* >. And a beast will not attack a beast, or a wolf, a wolf, (4) unless the animal goes mad and in its fury does not know what it is doing. (5) Very well, if a wolf will not eat a wolf because they look alike, how can the archons eat us, if we are of the same < kind >? Won't they treat us gently instead, with the idea of preserving their own kinds? And the tramp's arguments are refuted from every standpoint.

77,1 Then again, he seizes on the text from the Gospel, "All cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given."[375] And what the Savior said was not about teaching here, but about eunuchs. (2) However, if "Not all can receive it," is here applied to his teaching by the Savior, then, if they will not receive it, this is intentionally. These people, then, will be termed praiseworthy or blameworthy by their own choice and their acceptance of the teaching cannot be by nature. Otherwise, what good would it do the Savior to give his teaching? (3) So Mani's argument has failed in every respect. The Savior did not make this declaration about teaching, but about eunuchhood, and even if he had said it about teaching, Mani's argument would not hold good.

77,4 Again, Mani says, "I knew my own, 'For my sheep know me and I know my sheep.' "[376] But he is a liar in everything. He said this of the

374 Cf. Act. Arch. 16.10.
375 Matt 19:11.
376 John 10:14. Cf. Act. Arch. 28.1.

audience at the debate, because he wanted to catch souls by cozening and as it were setting a trap, so that they would see fit to join him because of the flattery. (5) Then, once they had joined him, he could begin to boast, and say that he knew them before they came to him. (6) But the outcome for him was the same as the Greek myth about the soothsayer Apollo, who told other people's fortunes but could not tell his own, and instead failed in his prediction—(7) for he was in love with Daphne, and because of her discretion failed to win her. Mani too prophesied that he knew his own, and actually came for Marcellus, to obtain his submission. But his oracle failed. Neither Marcellus, nor anyone else who was present on that occasion, was convinced by him.

78,1 Next he said that no one was saved in ancient times,[377] but [only] from the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar until his own day. (Probus was emperor then, and his predecessor Aurelian, when this Mani was alive.) (2) And in this too he is completely refuted, since the Gospel, and the words of the apostles, speak of those who have already been saved. The Lord likewise says, 'There shall be required of this generation all the righteous blood that hath been shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, which was shed between the temple and the altar."[378] How could Abel be righteous, how could Zacharias, unless salvation were already possible, and because they had already been saved by the Law and the prophets? < Thus the apostle also* > says, "Death reigned from Adam to Moses,"[379] to show you that death was checked, though not altogether destroyed, in Moses' time.

78,4 For Moses acknowledged the "Finisher"[380] of all things, "Jesus," who, when he gave himself for the human race—the immortal dying, the invulnerable become vulnerable, life enduring suffering in the flesh—would, through death, break the one who had control of death, and the sting of sin, and death. Then at last < the words >, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?"[381] would come true.

78,5 For there, in Moses' time, the death which had reigned until Moses was restrained and checked. And Abel was righteous before that, and Enoch, "who was taken away that he might not see death, and was not

377 Cf. Act. Arch. 32.4.
378 Matt 23:35. Cf. Act. Arch. 33.5.
379 Rom 5:14. Cf. Act. Arch. 32.4.
380 Heb 12:2.
381 1 Cor 15:55.

found."[382] (6) But there < was > no written Law yet—only the law which comes into being naturally from our minds, and by tradition, successively from fathers to sons.[383] When, however, the Law was given overtly, it became, as it were, a sword to cut the power of sin in two. But when the Savior arrived, the sting of death was broken. And again, < when this corruptible puts on incorruption and this mortal puts on immortality* >, then death will be swallowed up in victory.

78,7 And see how God saved by many means, but the fullness of salvation has come and will come in Christ Jesus, our Lord, as the Gospel says, "Of his fullness have we all received."[384] (8) And which "fullness?" 'The Law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ."[385] There, it was "given"; here, it has "come." If the Law, grace and truth come through Jesus of < his > fullness, the Old and the New Testaments < are from the same Testator, who gives them* > in the Law, in grace, and in truth.

79,1 But Mani has also utilized another text and says that "Christ has bought us free from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us."[386] (2) Well then, he should tell us what the sale cost, what price was paid (for us)! Paul didn't say "bought," but, "redeemed." However, Mani understands the purchase, but doesn't know the price.

But the truth admits of both expressions. (3) Christ has indeed redeemed us and bought us "free from the curse of the Law by being made a curse for us." And the teacher of the church immediately adds the way in which Christ bought us, and says, "Ye were bought with a price,"[387] "the precious blood of Christ, the lamb without blemish and without spot."[388] Now if we were bought with the blood, you are not one of the purchased, Mani, for you deny the blood.

79,4 Tell me, from whom did he buy us? Did he buy us as someone else's property? If so, was our former owner out of funds and in need of our purchase price, and did he take it and give us to Christ? And if we have been given to Christ, we no longer belong to our former owner.

---

382 Cf. Gen 5:24.
383 Cf. Act. Arch. 32.9.
384 John 1:16.
385 John 1:17.
386 Gal 3:13. The thought is common in Manichean writings; cf. CMC 16,2–9, "to redeem the captives from the tyrants [?] and free his own members from subjection to the rebels and the power of the governors" et al.
387 1 Cor 6:20.
388 1 Pet 1:19.

79,5 If, therefore, our former owner no longer possesses us, however, then he has been deprived of his abundance and has no authority in his own domain. How, then, can he "work in the children of disobedience,"[389] as the scripture says? (6) But this utter madman who has opened his mouth without being able to "affirm that whereof he speaks,"[390] does not understand how Christ ever bought us, does not understand that we were redeemed, or how Christ became a curse for us. (7) I can see them addressing Christ at the regeneration of his coming and crying out, "In thy name we ate, and in thy name cast out devils.[391] And he shall say to them, Depart from me ye cursed, I never knew you."[392] (8) How can they confess him, and he curse them? But what was the curse of the Law? The curse of the Law was the cross, on our sns' account.

For if someone was taken in a transgression, the Law said, "And ye shall hang him on a tree. The sun shall not set upon him, upon his corpse, but ye shall surely take him down and shall surely bury him before the setting of the sun, for cursed is he that hangeth on the tree."[393] (9) Thus, since the curse had been pronounced because of the crucifixion he himself, when he came, "bare our sins upon the tree"[394] by "giving himself for us."[395] His blood has bought us, his body taken away the curses that were on us—that is, through the penance of the cross, and through his coming, it has done away with the sins. (10) Thus the Law was not a curse, never think it! Neither the Gospel nor the Lord received the curse; but because of his death, the death decreed for sin is destroyed.

80,1 Next he says that the Law "was the ministration of death."[396] < But > I have already said a great deal to show that it was not a minister of death. (2) It did not order murder, but commanded, "Thou shalt do no murder."[397] Its ministry was a ministry of death because it murdered the murderer to prevent murder through the murder of one person, so that many would be afraid because of the one person, keep their wickedness in check and commit no more murders. This was not to minister death,

389 Eph 2:2.
390 1 Tim 1:7.
391 Matt 7:22 (Luke 13:26).
392 Luke 13:27.
393 Cf. Deut 21:33.
394 1 Pet 2:24.
395 Gal 1:4.
396 2 Cor 3:7.
397 Exod 20:13.

but to ensure the death of the murderer so that many would no longer become murderers.

80,3 But when the Savior came, since the pedagogue had at last made his charges peaceable for the greater part of the time, the Savior gave the more advanced lessons. In agreement with the Law of "Thou shalt do no murder; Thou shalt not steal; Thou shalt not bear false witness"[398] (4) the Savior said, "To him that smiteth thee on the right cheek turn to him the other also,"[399] in order to make the ministry a ministry of life with murder eliminated altogether. For if someone receives a blow on the cheek, he offers no provocation to murder. Instead, by his humility he disarms the murderer's hand, and soothes the wickedness in him. And thus all the ancient laws, and the New Testament, are in agreement.

81,1 Then he seizes on something else, as a covert way of introducing two pieces of evidence for the dyad he speaks of—the dyad of the natures which I mentioned before, of two principles with no beginnings, and of two roots. In his desire to say something similar about a distinction between things, he ventures to distinguish them as follows, and is not ashamed to say, (2) "The Old Testament said, The silver is mine and the gold is mine";[400] but the New Testament says, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."[401]

81,3 But he does not know that the Old Testament also says, "The poor and the rich have met together: but the Lord is the maker of them both."[402] And the New Testament agrees, and pronounces a blessing on the poor who are literally poor, and in another passage a blessing on the poor in spirit, so that both pronouncements have force. Thus Peter can point with pride to his literal poverty and say, "Silver and gold have I none, but what I have, I give thee; in the name of Jesus Christ, rise up and walk,"[403] (4) so that the blessing of the actually poor means nothing contradictory to the blessing of the poor in spirit. The "poor in spirit" are persons in righteous possession of property, while the "poor" are the humble, of whom Christ said, "I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat, thirsty, and ye gave me drink," and so on.[404]

---

398 Exod 20:13; 15–16.
399 Matt 5:39.
400 Hag 2:9.
401 Matt 5:3. The argument, and this scriptural text, are found at Act. Arch. 44.8.
402 Prov 22:2.
403 Acts 3:6.
404 Matt 25:35, cf. Act. Arch. 44.9–10.

81,5 Next he explains, 'These (i.e., the poor in spirit) acted of their abundance";[405] and you see one and the same Spirit speaking of the poor and the rich in the Old Testament and the same in the New, just as the Savior praises them both. (6) For as he was watching the treasury he saw people putting money into the treasury, and did not refuse the gifts of the rich; but he praised the widow who had put in the two mites for her [actual] poverty, as we have said, in fulfillment of the scripture, "The poor and the rich have met together: but the Lord is the maker of them both."[406] (81,7) And to show that this is so, and the Spirit of the Old and the New Testaments is the same, see the apostle say of the ancient prophets, "The time would fail me to tell of Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephtha, David and the other prophets who wandered about in sheepskins, in goatskins, being tormented, straitened, afflicted, of whom the world was not worthy."[407] For I have found that Isaiah wore sackcloth, and Elijah too. And do you see how, in the Old and the New Testaments, the poor are called blessed for piety, and the rich are called blessed for righteousness?

82,1 Then once more, the same Mani says, "The Old Testament commands us to keep the Sabbath, and if one did not keep it he was stoned, as one was put < to death > for gathering a bundle of sticks. But the New Testament, that is, the Lord in the Gospel, said, "I work, and my Father worketh.'[408] The disciples plucked ears of grain on the Sabbath, and he healed on the Sabbath. And not only this, but He said besides, 'Take up thy bed, and go unto thine house." '[409]

82,2 Such ignorance! There is nothing worse than lack of knowledge, for ignorance has made many people blind. When has the Sabbath not been broken for a good cause? When was not only the Sabbath, but every day not a forbidden day for evil?

82,3 Moses' successor Joshua the son of Nun, who counts as a prophet, was God's chosen, and stopped the sun and moon by prayer when he said, "Let the sun be still over Gibeon, and the moon over the valley of Ajalon,"[410] plainly broke the Sabbath for the performance of a good work. (4) When traveling farther than the prescribed six stades was not allowed on the Sabbath, he circled the walls of Jericho for seven days. But the

405 Mark 12:44; Luke 21:4.
406 Prov 22:2.
407 Heb 11:32; 37.
408 John 5:11.
409 Matt 9:6. Cf. Act. Arch. 44:9–10.
410 Josh 10:12–13.

circumference of Jericho is more than twenty stades; if they circled it for seven days, the Sabbath surely fell on one of the days. (5) But this was God's command, to show his will to work wonders. For there were no machines or catapults, no battering-rams, no siege engines; the enemy's walls sagged and fell solely at the sound of a ram's horn and the prayer of a righteous man. (6) For their punishment was due, since the tally of the Amorites' sins had been completed.

83,1 The Law was a judge of iniquity and rewarded everyone in accordance with his own works. The Amorites were in sin, had fallen into transgression, and had violated the oath they had sworn. I have already said this elsewhere, but to repeat it here will do no harm. (2) This is an example of Mani's frightfulness which comes to mind: "Some 'good' God of the Law! He spoiled the Egyptians, expelled the Amorites, Girgashites and other nations, and gave their land to the children of Israel. If he said, 'Thou shalt not covet,'[411] how could he give them other people's property?"

83,3 The ignoramus did not know that they had taken their own land back which had been seized from them, and that retribution was exacted for the pact that was made between them with a true determination and oath. (4) For when Noah was saved from the flood—and his wife, with his three sons and their three brides—he alone divided the whole world as the passage, and nothing foolish or false, states, distributing it by casting lots in Rhinocorura[412] to his three sons Shem, Ham and Japheth.

83,5 For Rhinocorura means Neel, and its inhabitants actually call it that; but in Hebrew it means "lots," since Noah cast the lots for his three sons there. (6) And the allotment from Rhinocorura, Gadiri fell < to Ham >, including Egypt, the Marean Marsh, Ammon, Libya, Marmaris, Pentapolis, Macatas, Macronas, Leptis Magna, Syrtis, and Mauritania, out to the so-called Pillars of Hercules and the interior of Gadiri. (7) These were Ham's possessions to the south. But he also owned the land from Rhinocorura eastwards, Idumaea, Midianitis, Alabastritis, Homeritis, Axiomitis, Bugaea, and Diba, out to Bactria.

83,8 The same allotment marks off the east for Shem. Roughly, Shem's allotment was Palestine, Phoenicia and Coele-Syria, Commagene, Cilicia, Cappadocia, Galatia, Paphlagonia, Lazia, Iberia, Caspia, and Carduaea, out to Media in the north. (9) From there this allotment assigns the north

---

411 Exod 20:17.

412 Rhinocorura comes from LXX Isa 27:12, where it is used to translate נעל. Epiphanius, who is the first to place Noah's division of the world here, is thinking of the resemblance between נחל and נחלה, "lot."

to Japheth. And in the west < Japheth was allotted > the land between Europe and Spain, and Britain, < Thrace, Europe, Rhodope > and the peoples who border on it, the Venetians, Daunians, Iapygians, Calabrians, Latins, Oscans [and] Megarians, out to the inhabitants of Spain and Gaul, and the lands of the Scots and Franks in the north.

84,1 When the allotments had been so made Noah called his three sons together and bound them with an oath, so that none of them would encroach on his brother's allotment and be covetous of his brother. (2) But, being covetous, Canaan the son of Ham invaded Palestine and held it, and the land was named Canaan because Canaan settled in it after leaving his own allotment, which he thought was hot. (3) And he settled in Shem's land, which is now called Judaea, and fathered the following sons: Amorraeus, Girgashaeus, Pherizaeus, Jebusaeus, Hivaeus, Arucaeus, Chittaeus, Asenaeus, Samaraeus, Sidonius and Philistiaeus. (4) And so, to show that the number of their sins against the oath was reaching completion, the Lord says in the Law, "The sins of the Amorites have not yet been completed."[413] And therefore [Israel] remained in the mountains and loitered in the wilderness, until the Amorites rendered themselves self-condemned by going to war with the wronged sons of Shem.

84,5 For Shem was the father of Arphaxad, Arphaxad of Kenah, Kenah of Selah, Selah of Eber, Eber of Peleg, Peleg of Reu, Reu of Serug, Serug of Nahor, Nahor of Terah, Terah of Abraham, Abraham of Isaac, Isaac of Jacob, Jacob of Judah, Judah of Perez, Perez of Esrom, Esrom of Aram, Aram of Aminadab, Aminadab of Naason. (6) In the time of Naason the head of the tribe of Judah and in the time Joshua the son of Nun, the sons of Shem took their own land with no wrong involved, but a putting to rights. And so the walls of Jericho fell of themselves, for righteousness avenges unrighteousness. (7) They circled the walls on seven days, and the Sabbath was violated so that righteousness would be fulfilled.

85,1 And not only this, but the sacred lampstand in the tent of the testimony had seven lamps, and the seven lamps were all lit every day. Not one remained unlit on any day; on every day there was the same light. (2) For the Sabbath was not instituted for the stoppage of work but for good work. While no one in the twelve tribes ever worked [on the Sabbath], the altar alone did not stand idle, as the Lord says in the Gospel, "Your priests profane the Sabbath in the temple, and are blameless."[414]

---

413 Gen 15:16.
414 Matt 12:5.

(3) But "They profane the Sabbath" means that they break it. But how do they break it but by offering sacrifice to God, so that the altar will not stand idle?

85,4 And not only this. The sun rises and sets, the moon waxes and wanes, winds blow, fruit is produced, mothers give birth, and it all takes place on the Sabbath. (5) And thus when the Lord came he did not practice carpentry or coppersmithing on the Sabbath, or < do > anything else [of the sort], but as God he did the work of God. And he says, "Take up thy bed and walk,"[415] to make his ongoing work known from the man carrying the bed, so that all will recognize Him who has come from heaven to the aid of the sons of men.

85,6 For he did in fact come to abolish the Sabbath, but he could not have abolished it if it had been other than his own. No one destroys someone else's work unless he is a renter[416] and a nuisance, the kind of person who asks for punishment. (7) But since the Sabbath belonged to him he said, "The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath"; and he said, "Man was not made for the Sabbath, but the Sabbath for man."[417] (8) Now if God made the Sabbath for man, and valued man more highly than the Sabbath, then < there is one God, who made the law of the Sabbath* > so that everyone would be aware of the rest < God has given us [now*] >, and the repose of the things to come; for the things here are types of the heavenly things. (9) Here things are partial, but there is all perfection. So the Sabbath of the Law was in force until Christ's arrival. But he abolished that Sabbath and gave us the supreme Sabbath, the Lord himself, our Rest and Sabbath Repose.

85,10 Thus the Old Testament is no different from the New, or the New from the Old. However, if an unschooled, ignorant person sees two ladles draw water from one stream, but supposes because of the difference of the ladles that the kinds of water [in them] are different too, the wise will tell him the truth, "Taste the two ladles, and see that there are two ladles, but one stream." (11) Thus there is one Lord, one God, one Spirit who has spoken in the Law and Prophets, and in the Gospel. This is why there are not two Old Testaments and not two New Testaments. There are not two testators but one, who makes the Old Testament old and the New Testament new—not by reducing the Old Testament to nothing but

[415] John 5:8.
[416] ἐκλήμπτωρ translates the Latin conductor, or susceptor.
[417] Mark 2:28; 27.

by bringing the Old Testament to a close and adding the inheritance of abundance through the second Testament

86,1 Mani introduces yet another text by saying, "I know that spirit is saved without body.[418] For the apostle teaches this," says he, "with the words, 'It is actually reported that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as is not found even among the gentiles, that one should have his father's wife. And ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned, that he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you. I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already him that hath done this deed, when ye and the Lord are gathered together with my spirit, to deliver such an one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord.[419] (2) But the destruction of the flesh is its entire reduction to nothing. If the flesh is reduced to nothing by the devil's agency, and the spirit is saved, how can there still be a resurrection of bodies or flesh, and a salvation of spirit?"[420]

86,3 And in his total ignorance he did not know that "The works of the flesh are fornication, adultery, uncleanness"[421] and similar things, and < that > Paul is not speaking of the flesh itself, but of the works of the flesh. (4) When fornication is committed, the flesh commits it. But if one practices continence, the flesh is no longer flesh. The flesh has been turned to spirit as the apostle says, "He who joined both at the beginning said, For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh."[422] "Thus he which is joined to an harlot is one body, and he which is joined unto the Lord is one spirit."[423]

86,5 Thus if someone commits fornication he has become "flesh"—and not just his flesh itself, but everything about him, his soul and the rest, becomes "flesh." He became flesh by his union with the harlot, and since he is fleshly the whole of him is called flesh. "But he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit"—that is, his body, his soul and everything in the man, is one spirit in the Lord.

---

418 Man. Hom. 75,13–14, "their souls went to the heavens, their bodies returned to the ground."

419 1 Cor 5:1–5.

420 Chapter 13 of the Kephalaia, pp. 45,16–46,12, is entitled "On the Five Saviors Who Raise the Dead, and on the Five Resurrections." The chapter is fragmentary, but the five resurrections are surely "spiritual" or metaphorical.

421 Gal 5:19.

422 Eph 2:14; 5:31.

423 1 Cor 6:16–17.

86,6 And the same apostle says in his legislation on the subject, "God hath set the members in the body, every one of them as it hath pleased him."[424] And see how he acknowledges that God is the maker of the body, and the Disposer of our members as he has willed, by his wisdom and goodness.

86,7 Then again, in place of the illustration of our own bodies < he introduces the illustration of the body* > of Christ, < and says >, "As we are the body of Christ and members in particular,"[425] and, "the church of God, which is the body of Christ."[426] (8) Now if God's church is a body, < but > it is one spirit when it is joined to the Spirit, that is, to the Lord, then a member who sins ceases to be spirit and becomes entirely flesh, in his soul and body, and everything in him.

86,9 Otherwise, how could part of someone be delivered to Satan, and part not delivered? Paul did not say that the man's *flesh* was delivered to Satan, but ordered the delivery of "such an one." But since he says, "such an one," (10) he has delivered a man whole, with his soul and entire manhood. If he has delivered him whole, however, he has declared that he is entirely flesh. But he said that "the spirit" is saved at the day of the Lord, so that the church would not be held responsible for the fault of the man who fell, and the whole church polluted by the transgression of the one. < Thus > what he means is, "Deliver the one who has fallen, that the spirit, that is, the whole church, may be saved."

87,1 But, says Mani, the scripture says, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God";[427] and here he thinks he has a point. In fact, however, *fornication* cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven, nor can adultery, uncleanness or idolatry; that is, "flesh and blood" cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven.

87,3 If you suppose, however, that the "flesh and blood" [mentioned here] is the actual flesh, what application can be left for, "And as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, who were born, not of the flesh, but of God?"[428] Who in the world has been born without flesh? (3) But because their *minds* were changed—not the *natures* of those who are born of flesh and blood mothers and fathers, [but their *minds*]—and they were born with the second birth, which is

---

424 1 Cor 12:18.
425 Read ἐκ μέρους with 1 Cor 12:27. MSS ἐκ μέλους is surely an error.
426 Eph 1:22–23.
427 1 Cor 15:53.
428 John 1:12–13.

birth from the Lord by Spirit and fire, he gave them the right to become the sons of God.

87,4 Thus, as they were born of flesh and blood here, < so in turn they are born again of spirit* >. And because of their conversion to righteousness their birth is no longer counted as a birth of flesh and blood, although < they live* > in flesh and blood—as he says, "For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh."[429] (5) Thus there can be flesh that does not "war after the flesh." And this is why he says that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven. He < is not speaking > of this flesh which has grown weary [in welldoing], been sanctified, pleased God, but of the "flesh" which is counted as sinful. (6) Otherwise what application can there be of "This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality?"[430]

87,7 But so that no one will fall into error and despair of the body's resurrection because of its evil works, the same apostle puts this more clearly and says, "Put to death your members upon earth, which are fornication, adultery, uncleanness,"[431] and so on. < And see that he means the members that do not rise, the passions of the flesh.* > (8) On the other hand, listen to the angels who appeared to the Galilaeans and said, "This Jesus whom ye have seen taken up from you, shall so come *in like manner as* ye have seen him taken up."[432]

From all that I have said, the sensible can understanding the meaning in all the words of the truth, and in those of this so-called Mani's falsehood. And even if I have overlooked some text, all his lies are detectable by means of the two or three testimonies which I have mentioned.

We have gone over a long, hard road and many dangerous places, and < have* > with difficulty < crushed the head* > of this amphisbaena and venomous reptile, the cenchritis, which has coils of many illustrations for the deception of those who see it, and conceals beneath it the sting and poisonous source < of the lies of heathen mythology* >. (3) For since Mani is a pagan with the pagans and worships the sun and moon, the stars and daemons, the man < is heathen* >, and his sect teaches heathen religion. < And besides this* > he knows the lore of the magi and is involved with

---

429 2 Cor 10:3.

430 1 Cor 15:53.

431 Col 3:5.

432 Cf. Acts 1:11; Man. Ps. 86,19–21, "Thou madest me worship these Luminaries and the Fathers that are in them, that ferry across them that believe to the Land of the Immortals."

them, and he praises astrologers and practices their mumbo jumbo. He merely mouths the name of Christ, as the cenchritis too conceals its poison, and deceives people with its tangled coils by hiding in deep woods and matching its background.

88,4 But with the power of God, the cudgel of the truth, the blood of Christ, his body truly born of Mary, the resurrection of the dead, and the confession of the one Divine Unity, we have crushed the head of the dragon upon the waters, put this many-headed sect to flight and smashed its head. Let us close with gratitude to God and hurry on to the other sects, calling on God to be the help of our weakness, so that we may keep the promise we have made in God, and give him perfect thanks.

Against Hieracites.[1] *47, but 67 of the series*

1,1 After the savage onset of this rotten, poisonous teaching of Mani, the worst of all heresies and like that of a snake, there arose a man named Hieracas, the founder of the Hieracites. (2) He lived at Leontus in Egypt[2] and had quite a bit of education, for he was proficient in the Greek and other literary studies, and well acquainted with medicine and the other subjects of Greek and Egyptian learning, and perhaps he had dabbled in astrology and magic. (3) For he was very well versed in many subjects and, as his works show, < an extremely scholarly > expositor of scripture.[3] He knew Coptic very well—the man was Egyptian—and was also quite clear in Greek, for he was quick in every way.

1,4 He was supposedly Christian but did not persevere in Christ's regime, for he strayed from it, slipped, and came to grief. He could recite the Old and New Testaments accurately from memory and gave expositions of them, but because of his foolishness he privately held whatever doctrines suited his fancy and came into his head.

1,5 Hieracas too holds that the flesh never rises, only the soul.[4] He claims, however, that there is a spiritual resurrection. And he collected

---

[1] 1,3, 3,3, and the quotations from Hieracas at 2,2–6,7 and 3,2–3 show that Epiphanius knows a work or works by Hieracas, or has seen quotations from them. The Life of Epiphanius, 27, says that Epiphanius had a personal encounter with Hieracas and rebuked him, but had this been the case, Epiphanius would have said so here. In fact, at 68,1,2 Epiphanius dates Hieracas in the time of Diocletian.

[2] So at Vit. Epiph. 27.

[3] Holl: ἐν εξηγήσει< φιλοκαλώτατος >.

[4] Vit. Epiph. 27 says "not this flesh, but another in its place."

whatever texts he could < find > in the sacred scripture to support his position, and thus heaped them up and wickedly concocted any old cheap fictions for proof of his heresy. (6) But he was awesome in his asceticism, and able to win souls to himself; for example, many Egyptian ascetics were convinced by him. I suppose it was because he took the cue for it from Origen that he denied that the resurrection of the dead is a resurrection of the flesh—or, spat this up out of his own head.

1,7 He does not countenance matrimony, and claims that this is an an ordinance of the Old Testament. For he recognizes Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, and all the saints alike, Isaiah and Jeremiah too, and regards them as prophets. (8) He says that the contracting of matrimony is permitted in the Old Testament, but that since Christ's coming marriage is no longer accept< able >,[5] (9) and cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven.

For, he asks, what new thing did the Word come to do? What new message did the Only-begotten come to give and set right? If it was about the fear of God, the Law had this. If it was about marriage, the scriptures had proclaimed it. If it was about envy, covetousness and iniquity, all this is in the Old Testament. But Christ came to make only this correction—to preach continence in the world, and choose the pure and the continent for his own; and without continence no < one > can be saved.

2,1 Hieracas collects the warrants for this from all sorts of places—for example, when the scriptures say, "and your consecration, without which no man shall see God."[6] (2) And if they ask him, "Why did the apostle say, 'Marriage is honorable and the bed undefiled, but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge,' "[7] < he replies, "But on the other hand the apostle says, 'It is good for a man not to touch a woman,'*>[8] (3) and adds immediately, < 'It is good for a man so be.' " >[9] And skipping a little he says, " 'The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord, how she may please the Lord, likewise the virgin. But she that is married careth how she may please her husband, and is divided.'[10] (4) Now if there is division, where there is division how can there be union? And if the married woman does not please God but her husband, how can she have her inheritance with

[5] At Ps.-Ath. Haer., PG 28, 516C, it is said that Hieracas will not accept the marriage of Adam and Eve as a precedent for the legitimacy of matrimony because he rejects the Old Testament.

[6] Heb 12:14.

[7] Heb 13:4.

[8] 1 Cor 7:26.

[9] 1 Cor 7:26.

[10] Cf. 1 Cor 7:34.

God? (5) < The apostle > doesn't < say >, 'To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife,'[11] in order to commend matrimony after the incarnation, but in order to bear with it, to prevent falls into further ruin. 'For there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake.'[12] And Paul says, 'I will that all men be even as I myself.'[13] (6) And 'The kingdom of heaven is likened unto ten virgins, five foolish and five wise.'[14] Wise virgins, foolish virgins, are likened to the kingdom of heaven—but virgins! He didn't say, 'married persons.' " And he heaps up a great deal of material of this kind for his supposed abolition of matrimony, if you please.

2,7 Hieracas does not accept children who die before the age of reason,[15] but excludes them from the hope in which we believe. They cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven, he says, because they have not taken part in the contest. "For if a man strive, yet is he not crowned except he strive lawfully."[16] If even someone who strives is not crowned unless he strives lawfully, how much more those who have not yet been summoned to the arena?

2,8 Again, of course like Origen as I said, he does not believe that Paradise is an actual place or that the resurrection of the dead is a resurrection of the flesh. He says that there is a resurrection of the dead but that it is a resurrection of souls, and makes up some spiritual mythology. (9) And no one can worship with them without being a virgin, a monk, continent or a widow.

3,1 But Hieracas does not agree with Origen about the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.[17] He believes that the Son is really begotten of the Father and, as to the Holy Spirit, < he asserts > that he is the Spirit of the Father. (2) He, however, as I remarked above in the Sect of the Melchizedekians, claims that the Holy Spirit is Melchizedek himself[18] because "< the apostle > has said, 'He maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered.'[19] And who is this? Who but < 'he that

[11] 1 Cor 7:2.
[12] Matt 19:12.
[13] 1 Cor 7:7.
[14] Matt 25:1–2.
[15] Cf. Vit. Epiph. 27. The Greek here is literally, "before knowledge."
[16] 2 Tim 2:5.
[17] Cf. Arius Ep. Ad Alexandrum at Pan. 69,7,6.
[18] Pan. 55,5,2–4.
[19] Rom 8:26.

was made like unto the Son of God, who > remaineth a priest forever?' But it says, 'a *priest* forever,'[20] because of the intercession."

3,3 This Spirit met with Abraham then, since he is like the Son. "And this," says Hieracas, "is why the apostle < says >, 'without father, without mother, without descent.'[21] 'Without mother' " he says, "because he has no mother. 'Without father' because he had no father on earth, but is 'made like unto the Son of God, and remaineth a priest forever.' " And he talked lots of nonsense about the Holy Spirit, and went to a great deal of trouble over him.

3,4 He believes he can draw his clinching proof from the Ascension of Isaiah, supposedly because the so-called Ascension tells us that Isaiah said, "The angel that walked before me showed me, and he showed me and said, 'Who is that on the right hand of God?' And I said, 'Sir, thou knowest.' He said, 'This is the Beloved. (5) And who is the other, who is like him, that hath come from the left?' And I said, 'Thou knowest.' < He said >, 'This is the Holy Spirit, that speaketh in thee and in the prophets.' And," Isaiah says, " 'he was like unto the Beloved.' "[22] Hieracas utilizes this as proof of the scriptural saying, "Made like unto the Son of God, he remaineth a priest forever."

3,6 Now how many things, even about this, can my mind think of in opposition to this phony teaching of his ? (7) He died in old age. He wrote both in Greek and in Coptic, expositions he had composed < of > the six days of creation, fabricating some legends and pompous allegories. But he wrote on any number of other scriptural subjects and composed many latter-day psalms. (8) And many of those who believe[23] in his doctrines abstain from meat. Hieracas himself really practiced a great deal of asceticism, but his disciples after him do it hypocritically. He himself abstained from all sorts of foods, and denied himself wine as well. (9) And some say of him that, although he lived past ninety, he practiced calligraphy till the day of his death—he was a calligrapher. For his vision remained unimpaired.

4,1 All right, let's investigate this man's tares too. With which of the sacred scripture's ideas should we join ourselves to scotch this poisonous snake that strikes front and back like a scorpion? For it heaped up material from two Testaments to do harm, not as the sacred words are

---

[20] Heb 7:3.
[21] Heb 7:3.
[22] Asc. Isa. 9.33.
[23] Holl τῶν πειθομένων αὐτοῦ τοῖς δόγμασιν, MSS τῶν ἀληθινῶν αυτοῦ τοῦ δόγματος.

but as his false thinking formed obscure notions of things that are clear. (2) Honey is not nasty or bitter, and neither are the nicer foods God has created. But if they are given to a fever patient they seem bitter in his mouth, not because the sweet things have turned bitter, but because the patient's taste has imparted bitterness to the things he is given. (3) In the same way, no one who has fallen away from the truth has been deceived by the truth; he tasted the truth with bitter thoughts and it has been made bitter for him.

4,4 But let's see, what shall we say about the children—the ones who were killed for Christ at once, in Bethlehem of Judaea? Are such as they without part in the kingdom of heaven, or do they have a part? They do, since they are innocent. (5) For if they have no part in it, then the Lord has become an accessory to their murder, for they were killed for him. But if they were killed for him and thus had no opportunity to enter the contest or gain the prize, then the Lord's advent, which was intended < for salvation >, has become harmful to the world instead. For it has become the cause of the untimely departure of the babes, since they were punished and fell victim to the king's menace, so that they could not enter the contest to gain its rewards.

4,6 But let's look at some other considerations. Call Solomon, the blessed and the wisest man of all, to confound this Hieracas! Come here, you most blessed of prophets, who "received of the Lord a profusion of heart and wisdom, as the sand upon the seashore."[24] What would you think of the children? (7) And Solomon replies, "Old age is not honorable, nor length of life, nor is the reckoning made by number of years. Wisdom is an hoary head for men, and a spotless life their old age. For in his innocence he was loved by God, and from living among sinners he was translated. He was rapt away, lest wickedness alter his understanding, or guile deceive his soul. For the influence of evil doth weaken things that are good, and the wandering of desire doth undermine an harmless mind."[25] (8) And because he is speaking of children he adds at once, "Being perfected in a short time he fulfilled < long years >"[26]—that is to say, he lived for many years even though he died young. "For his soul was pleasing unto the Lord, therefore he hasted to remove him from the midst

[24] 3 Kms 5:9.
[25] Wisd Sol 4:8–12.
[26] Wisd Sol 4:13.

of wickedness."[27] (9) And to Jeremiah the Lord says, "Before thou camnest forth from the womb I sanctified thee."[28]

5,1 But let's look at the Savior himself, the mouth that cannot lie, the one that knows all things. Come here, Lord, and lend your aid to our minds, but confound Hieracas and his rashness! (2) Scripture says, "There came unto him little children, that he might put his hands on them and bless them. But the disciples thrust them away and forbade them. But he said unto them, Suffer the little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me. For of such is the kingdom of God.[29] (3) And lest it be thought that the kingdom of heaven is composed solely of children and < seems* > not to < extend to* > all ages, he begins with the children, but has granted those who are *like* them to possess the inheritance with them. (4) For if those who are like them can reign, how much more the models for those who are like them? And Hieracas' fairy story has fallen flat.

5,5 For the Lord is merciful to all. "The Lord keepeth guard over the little ones,"[30] and, "Praise the Lord, ye children."[31] And the children cried out, "Hosannah in the highest, blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."[32] And, "Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings hast thou perfected praise."[33] And there are any number of other texts like them.

6,1 But as to the resurrection of the flesh, Hieracas you would-be sage, how can there not be a resurrection of flesh? The term itself shows the meaning of the expression. We cannot speak of the "rising" of something that has not fallen. (2) But what is it that fell? What was buried? What was destroyed but the body, and not the soul? A soul neither falls nor is buried. And how much is there to be said about this? We cannot speak of the resurrection of a soul; it is the body that is raised.

6,3 And as to the selection the Savior came to make of virgins, the continent, and the pure—to whom is it not plain that there is an election, and that < virginity* > is the pride of the holy catholic and apostolic church? < But the Savior accepts* > persons who are in lawful wedlock as well; for he is out to save "every man in his own order."[34] (4) How can "marriage"

---

27 Wisd Sol 4:14.
28 Jer 1:5.
29 Matt 19:13–14.
30 Ps 114:6.
31 Ps 112:1.
32 Matt 21:9.
33 Ps 8:3.
34 1 Cor 15:23.

not be "honorable"[35] and possess the kingdom of heaven in God, when the Savior was invited to a wedding for the purpose of blessing marriage? If he had refused to go to a wedding he would have been a destroyer of matrimony, and not the One who accepts each one, from pity for his weakness. Marriage is honorable, then, for he himself has so designated it. (5) This is why he went to a wedding—to stop the mouths of those who speak against the truth.

For Jesus performed a first miracle there in Cana of Galilee, by turning the water into wine. (6) As he had dawned from a virgin to show the light that dawned from the virgin to the world, so he performed his first miracle at a wedding in Cana of Galilee—to honor virginity by his conception and the ray of light that dawned through it, but to honor lawful wedlock by his miracles for he performed his first at a wedding, changing the water to unmixed wine.

6,7 Similarly, if marriage was wrong why does the teacher of the gentiles command it, as he says, "Younger widows refuse. For after they wax wanton against Christ, they will marry, having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith."[36] (8) What does he say then? "But let them marry, bear children, guide the house."[37] If Paul allows these things, how can you, Hieracas, teach that marriage is to be rejected after Christ's incarnation?

7,1 And as to your assertion that Melchizedek himself is the Spirit—in that case, the Spirit came and took flesh. It cannot, then, be just the Only-begotten who has been born in the flesh; the Spirit must have been too. But if the Spirit was born in the flesh—well, it was Mary who bore the Savior. Hieracas should say where the mother is who bore the Spirit.

7,2 And in saying, "Made like unto the Son of God he remaineth a priest forever,"[38] the scripture cannot be referring to the Holy Spirit. (3) It didn't say, "like the Son of God," but, "made like." Now "made like" refers to something that came to be at a later date. But if the Spirit is "made like" Christ after the time of Abraham, there was a time when there was no Spirit, and this is why he was "made like" the Son of God.

And how can he be "without father?" (4) If the Spirit is self-existent and not of the Godhead's own essence, it can fairly be shown that he is "without father." And indeed, the Son is *only-begotten* and has no brother, but is *the*

[35] Heb 3:4.
[36] 1 Tim 5:11.
[37] 1 Tim 5:14.
[38] Heb 7:3.

Son of God. (5) But even if we say that the Spirit is not begotten, since the Son is *only*-begotten, Christ still says that the Spirit "proceeded" from the Father" and "receiveth of the Son."[39] Hence the Spirit who "proceedeth from the Father" and "receiveth of me," cannot be "without father."

7,6 Even if he means " 'without mother' in heaven and 'without father' on earth"—for this can also be said of the Savior—why does the apostle explain this at the end by saying, "He whose descent is not counted *from them* received tithes of the patriarch Abraham?"[40] (7) [The phrase], "from them" is indicative of precise expression; for since his descent was not counted from the children of Israel he must surely have been descended from other nations. But because his father and mother are not recorded in the scriptures, those who misrepresent the truth imagine one thing in place of another. (8) I, though, have found both his mother and his father in traditions; he was descended from the Sidonians and the Canaanites. Thus his fairy story has crumbled. And his ascetic practice is of no avail; to settle for lifeless things coupled with wrong belief is no school of life and the hope of salvation. Scripture says, "Let *all* things be done to the glory of God."[41]

8,1 But here too, I believe enough has been said about them. We have broken the scorpion's wings and pulled its powers down. For Hieracas is a winged snake and scorpion which has wings of many kinds, and flies, and mimics the church's virginity but without a clear conscience. (2) For he and people like him are instances of "Having their conscience seared with an hot iron; and forbidding to marry, and to abstain from meats which God hath made to be received. For they are sanctified by the word of the living God and prayer, since all things are good and wholesome, and nothing is abominable with God."[42]

8,3 However, they are a complete laughing-stock because of the adoptive wives each of them has acquired, whom they are at pains to have for domestic service. (4) But as I said, we have pulled his wings off too, and broken his head with the wood of life, the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ. Let us go on to the rest, calling on God himself to aid us, so that we may reply to the remaining sects, and refute the heresies they palm vainly off on the world.

---

[39] John 15:26; 16:15.
[40] Heb 7:6.
[41] 1 Cor 10:31.
[42] Cf. 1 Tim 4:2–4.

< *Against* > *the Schism of Melitius the Egyptian.*[1]
48, but 68 of the series

1,1 There is a party of Melitians in Egypt whose founder was Melitius, a bishop in the Thebaid. He belonged to the catholic church and was of the orthodox faith, for his faith did not vary in any way from that of the holy catholic church. (2) Melitius was a contemporary of Hieracas, flourished at the same time as he, and became his successor. He was also a contemporary of St. Peter the bishop of Alexandria. (3) And all of these lived during the persecution in the reigns of Diocletian and Maximian. The affair of Melitius took place as follows.

1,4 He instigated a schism, but in no sense by an alteration of the faith. He was arrested during the persecution, with the holy bishop and martyr, Peter, and the other martyrs, by the officials the emperor had assigned to the task, the governors of Alexandria and Egypt at the time. (Culcianus was prefect of the Thebaid, and Hierocles, prefect of Alexandria.)[2]

1,5 Melitius too was confined in the prison, he and the martyrs we spoke of, with Peter the archbishop of Alexandria. Indeed, Melitius himself was held to be the first < of the bishops* >[3] in Egypt, (6) and second to Peter in the archiepiscopate, in order to assist him; but he was under him and referred ecclesiastical matters to him. (7) For it is the custom for the archbishop in Alexandria to have the ecclesiastical administration of all Egypt and the Thebaid, Mareotis, Libya, Ammon, Marmarica and Pentapolis.

1,8 Now all these had been arrested and were in prison awaiting martyrdom, and had remained in confinement for some time. Others, who had been condemned before them, were martyred, received their reward, and fell asleep; but these, as eminent and more important prisoners, were being kept for later. (2,1) And since some had been martyred, but others had missed martyrdom and committed the enormity of idol worship, those who had even been forced to partake of sacrifices since they had fallen away, and had offered sacrifice and committed the transgression,

---

[1] Some of Epiphanius' information comes from Athanasius' *Apologia Secunda*, but Epiphanius has other sources, including oral ones (cf. 3,1; 8). He is far more sympathetic to Melitius than was Athanasius. His account of Arius' death might be based on Athanasius' *Ad Serapionem, De Morte Arii*.

[2] In fact Culcianus seems to have been the Prefect of Egypt, and Hierocles his successor. See Holl *ad loc*.

[3] Or, "was regarded as < responsible for* > affairs in Egypt and < foremost* > in rank," Amidon's rendering of Hall's alternative emendation.

approached the confessors and martyrs to obtain the mercy of penance. Some were soldiers, but others were clergy of various ranks, the presbyterate, the diaconate and others.

2,2 There was a disturbance over this among the martyrs and no little trouble. For some said that persons who had once fallen away, denied the faith, and failed to maintain their courage or take part in the contest, should not be allowed penance. Otherwise the ones who were still left would have less regard for the penalty, and would be misled because of the forgiveness so speedily accorded the others, and come to the denial of God and the enormity of paganism. And the thing that was said by the confessors themselves was reasonable. (3) Those who said this were Melitius and Peleus, and more of the other martyrs and confessors with them. And since they had shown their zeal for God they obviously convinced < many >[4] by saying it.

2.4 They also went on to say, "If penance should be granted them after some time when the persecution is over, when peace has been restored—provided that they truly repent and show the fruit of repentance—it certainly should not mean that each be taken back in his own order. They may be received into the church and its communion after an interval, < but > into the order < of laity >, not as clergy." And this showed respect for the truth and was full of zeal.

3,1 But the most holy Peter, a kindly man and like a father to all, begged and pleaded, "Let us receive them and set them a penance if they repent, so that they will hold by the church, and let us not turn them out of their offices either"—or so I have been told. "Otherwise they < will be > disgraced, and those who, from cowardice and weakness, were once shaken and undermined by the devil, may be perverted entirely because of the delay, and not healed [at all]. As the scripture says, 'Let that which is lame not be turned out of the way; but let it rather be healed.' "[5]

3,2 And Peter's argument was on the side of mercy and kindness, and that of Melitius and his supporters on the side of truth and zeal. Then and there the schism started up, in the form of the seemingly godly proposals of both parties;[6] with some saying one thing, some the other.

3,3 For when Peter the archbishop saw that Melitius' party withstood his kindliness and were carried to extremes by their zeal for God, he

---

[4] Holl ἐπειθεν < πολλοῖς >, MSS ἔπασχον.

[5] Heb. 12:13.

[6] Athanasius, in contrast, says that Peter deposed Melitius for cause at a council, and that Melitius retaliated by starting the schism, Ath. Ap. Sec. 59.1.

himself hung a curtain in the middle of the prison by spreading out an himation—that is, a cloak or pallium—and proclaimed < through > a deacon, "Let those who are of my opinion come here to me; and let those who are of Melitius', to Melitius."

3,4 And the majority of bishops, presbyters and the other orders sided with Melitius; but a very few, bishops and a few others, < went > with Peter the archbishop. And after that the one group prayed by itself and the other by itself, and in the same way each held its other services separately.

3,5 Peter's martyrdom came and the blessed man was perfected, leaving Alexander as his successor in Alexandria. For he succeeded to the throne after Peter. (6) But Melitius and many others were sentenced to exile, and banished to the mines at Phaeno.

At that time those who were dragged off because of being confessors < went into schism* > with Melitius. Melitius himself, in prison < and > on his journey as he passed through every country and area, ordained clergy—bishops, presbyters and deacons—and founded his own churches. And the first group would not communicate with the second, nor the second with the first. (7) But each put a sign on its own church. Those who held the existing, old churches in succession from Peter, labeled theirs, "Catholic Church"; Melitius' succession labeled theirs, "Church of the Martyrs." (8) And so Melitius ordained many clergy in this way at Eleutheropolis, Gaza and Aelia, on his arrival.

3,9 Melitius served further time in the mines. Afterwards, however, the confessors were released from the mines, those of Peter's party—for there were still many—and those of Melitius'. For they did not communicate or pray with each other even in the mines.

But it was given Melitius to live in the world for a while longer, so that he flourished at the same time as Peter's successor, Alexander, and was on good terms < with him >. And he was anxious over the state of the church and the faith; for I have frequently said that he held no divergent beliefs.

4,1 For after he had come to Alexandria and spent some time there, holding his own assemblies with his own people, Melitius himself detected Arius. And as it was rumored that Arius, in his expositions, had gone beyond the prescribed bounds of the faith, he brought him to Alexander. (2) Arius was a presbyter at the church in Alexandria which is called Baucalis. There was one presbyter assigned to a church—for there were many churches, but now there are more—and the church was entrusted to him, even if there was another presbyter with him. When I need to I shall speak of these things in detail, at the proper place.

Since Alexander had zealously detected Arius, he summoned bishops, < called > a council and examined him, inquiring about his faith and demanding < an accounting > from Arius for the corruption of the heresy which had infected him. (3) And Arius denied nothing but indeed, brazenly replied that it was so. And Alexander excommunicated him, and with him there were excommunicated a large number, the virgins and other clergy who had been polluted by him.

4,4 Arius fled and made his way to Palestine. But when he reached Nicomedia and from there wrote letters to Alexander, he did not abandon the insane spirit of his heresy. (5) A little later, however, when Alexander, the holy bishop in Alexandria, had taken pains to arouse the blessed Constantine, Constantine called a council in the city of Nicaea.

4,6 And Arius' sect was anathematized. < But > after < Alexander died, Arius wished to be received back into the church* >. For he first denied his heresy before the blessed emperor Constantine, and pretendedly professed the orthodox formularies under oath. (7) But the emperor said to him, "If you are swearing with full sincerity, may your oath be confirmed, and you guiltless. But if you are swearing guilefully, may < God >, by whom you have sworn, take the vengeance on you!"[7] And this happened to him not long afterwards, as I shall say later.

4,8 In connivance with Eusebius the bishop of Nicomedia, who held the same beliefs as he, Arius was presented to the same emperor as having supposedly denied and condemned his heresy. And so Constantine directed and permitted Eusebius to receive Arius into the church at Constantinople in the presence of the bishop Alexander, who had the same name as the bishop of Alexandria but was the bishop of Constantinople.

5,1 But now, after the death of the confessor Melitius, Alexander of blessed memory, of Alexandria, renewed his anger against the schism in the church, and decided to offer every kind of harassment and hindrance to those who assembled by themselves and whom Melitius had left behind him, and forcibly prevent them from rebelling against the one church. But they were unwilling and caused trouble and disturbances. (2) And then, because of their oppression and restraint by the blessed Alexander, certain of them, who were the foremost and preeminent for their piety and life, undertook the journey to court with a petition, to request the privilege of

[7] Ath. Ep. Ad Serap. De Morte Arii, PG 25, 688A.

assembling by themselves without hindrance. (3) Those who did so were an important man named Paphnutius, an anchorite who was himself the son of a female confessor < and > had nearly been a confessor himself on a number of occasions; one of their bishops, John, also a highly respected man; and the bishop in Pelusium, Callinicus;[8] and certain others. (4) But when they went with their petition for the emperor, they were turned away and rebuffed. (5) For when the court officials heard the name, "Melitians," and did not know what that might be, they would not let them petition the emperor.

6,1 During this affair Paphnutius, John and < the > others had occasion to spend some time in Constantinople and Nicomedia. They became friends at this time with the bishop of Nicomedia, Eusebius, told him their story—they knew he had access to the emperor Constantine—and asked for his introduction to the emperor. (2) But after promising to present them to the emperor and do what they asked, he made this request of them—that they receive Arius, who was falsely feigning repentance,[9] into communion with them. (3) They promised him, and then Eusebius brought them to the emperor and explained their situation to him; and the emperor granted the Melitians permission to assemble by themselves from then on, without disturbance from anyone.

6,4 If only these Melitians, who had received the absolutely correct form of the truth, had communicated with the lapsees after penance instead of with Arius and his followers! (5) Theirs has been the proverbial fate of fleeing the smoke to fall into the fire. Arius could not have gained a foothold and voice except through this business, which has become an evil alliance for them even now. For the Melitians, who were once simon pure and absolutely correct in their faith, have gotten mixed in among the disciples of Arius. (6) And by now most of them have been defiled by Arius' heresy, and been turned away from the faith in our time. Even though some have continued to hold the true faith, they hold it, but, because of their communion with Arius and the Arians, are by no means out of the slimy muck.

6,7 But a little later—for as I promised to tell the whole business, I shall repeat it here—Alexander the bishop of Constantinople was compelled to receive Arius, although he prayed, groaned, and knelt before the

[8] John and Callinicus are numbers 25 and 34 in the list of Melitian bishops which Melitius is said to have furnished Alexander, Ath. Apol. Sec. 71.6.

[9] At Apol. Sec. 59.4 Athanasius claims that Eusebius took the initiative in courting the Melitians.

altar about the ninth hour of the Sabbath. And Eusebius said, "If you won't receive him willingly yourself he'll enter the church with me against your will tomorrow"—and the Lord's Day was dawning. (8) But as I said, after Alexander had prayed and besought our Lord either to take him away so that he would not be defiled with the blasphemer of the Lord, Arius, or else to work a wonder, as he does in every generation, the holy man's prayer was answered with small delay. (9) That night Arius went to the privy to relieve himself, and, like Judas once, burst. And thus his end came in a foul, unclean place.

7,1 Then, after this, their plots against the church were hatched by Arius' disciples. Alexander of Alexandria died after the council in Nicaea. (2) But Athanasius was not there (i.e., in Alexandria) after Alexander's death; he was a deacon under Alexander at that time, and had been sent to court by him.[10] (3) Although Alexander had given orders that no one but Athanasius be consecrated bishop—as he himself, and the clergy testified, and the whole church—the Melitians seized the opportunity and, since there was no bishop in Alexandria (Alexandria has never had two bishops, like the other cities) they consecrated a man named Theonas as bishop of Egypt in Alexander's place. And three months later he died. (4) Not long after Theonas' death, Athanasius arrived. And a council of orthodox bishops was summoned from all quarters. And thus Athanasius' consecration took place and the throne was given to him, the man who was worthy of it and for whom it had been prepared, in accordance with God's will and the testimony and command of < the > blessed Alexander.

7,5 And then Athanasius began to be distressed and saddened by the church's division, between the Melitians and the catholic church. He pleaded with them, exhorted them, and they would not listen; he pressed and urged them < and they would not obey* >.

Now Athanasius often visited the churches nearby, particularly the ones in Mareotis. (6) And once when the Melitians were holding a service a deacon, together with some laity, came rushing out of the crowd that was with Alexander and broke a lamp—as the story goes—and a fight broke out.[11] (7) This was the beginning of the intrigue against Athanasius, for the Melitians brought charges and false accusations against him, and misrepresented the facts, with the Arians lending their assistance to thse plot because of their envy of God's holy faith, and of orthodoxy. (8) And

[10] Cf. Ath. Ap. Sec. 6.1–2.
[11] Cf. Ath. Ap. Sec. 63.2–4.

they communicated with the emperor Constantine. But Eusebius, who, as I said, was the bishop of Nicomedia, was flunky to their whole gang, and the one who plotted the injury to the church and Pope Athanasius.

So the accusers went to the emperor and said that the implement which some, as I told you, said was a torch, was a vessel for the mysteries. (9) And they made certain other accusations. They claimed that a presbyter in Mareotis named Arsenius had been struck, and that his hand had been cut off with a sword, either by Athanasius' people or by Athanasius himself.[12] They even brought a hand to court and displayed it—it was in a box.[13]

8,1 On hearing this, the emperor grew angry. The blessed Constantine had a zeal for God; he had no idea that they were false accusers because of the Arians' anger against orthodoxy, which we have mentioned. And he commanded that a council be convened in Phoenicia, in the city of Tyre.[14] (2) He ordered Eusebius of Caesarea and certain others to sit as judges; if anything, however, they had a certain leaning towards the Arians' vulgar rant. And bishops of the Catholic church of Egypt were summoned, who < were > under Athanasius—eminent, distinguished men with illustrious lives in God. Among them was the blessed Potamon the Great, the bishop of Hieracleopolis and a confessor. And the Melitians were summoned as well, especially Athanasius' accusers.

8,3 The blessed Potamon was a zealot for truth and orthodoxy, a free-spoken man who had never shown partiality. His eye had been put out for the truth during the persecution. When he saw Eusebius sitting on the judge's bench and Athanasius standing, he was overcome with grief and wept, as honest men will, and shouted at Eusebius, (4) "Are you seated, Eusebius, with Athanasius before you in the dock, when he's innocent? Who can put up with things like that? Tell me—weren't you in prison with me during the persecution? I lost an eye for the truth, but you don't appear to be maimed and weren't martyred; you stand here alive without a mark on you. How did you get out of jail, if you didn't promise our persecutors to do the unthinkable—or if you didn't do it?"[15]

8,5 On hearing this Eusebius was roused to indignation. He arose and dismissed the court, saying, "If you've come here and answer me like that,

---

[12] Cf. Ath. Ap. Sec. 65.2—5.

[13] Cf. Theodoret H. E. 1.30; Soc. 1.29.6; Soz. 2.25.10; Rufinus 10.16.

[14] Cf. Ath. Ap. Sec. 71.2—79.4; Eus. Vit. Const. 4.41–45.3; Socr 1.28–33; Soz. 2.25.10; Rufinus 10.16; Theodoret H. E. 1.28.4; Philostorgius 2.11.

[15] Cf. Ath. Ap. Sec. 72.4.

your accusers are telling the truth. If you're playing the tyrant here, you'd much better go on home."

9,1 Then Eusebius and his fellow judges undertook to send two Pannonian bishops with Arian views, Ursaces and Valens, to Alexandria and Mareotis, where they said these things had happened—the affair of the vessel and the other circumstances of the fight.[16] (2) But although they went they did not bring back anything true but made up one perjury[17] after another, and brought false charges against the blessed Pope Athanasius. (3) And, fabricating them in writing as truth, they took them and referred them to the council of Eusebius and the others. Ursacius and Valens revealed this later by repenting, approaching the blessed Julius, the bishop of Rome, with a petition, and saying in admission of their fault, "We have accused Pope Athanasius falsely; but receive us into communion and penance."[18]

(4) And they sent their confirmations of this, writen in repentance, to Athanasius himself.[19] At Tyre Pope Athanasius, seeing that the plot he was faced with was in all respects a serious one, fled by night before his trial and confrontation with the false charges, came to Constantine at court, and gave him his side of the story with an explanation.[20]

(5) Constantine was still aggrieved, however, and remained angry because he thought that the accusers might well be telling the truth and the accused offering a false defense. But in spite of his anger Pope Athanasius sternly told the emperor, "God will judge between you and me, just as surely as you are in agreement with the traducers of my poor self." (6) And then he was condemned to exile because of what the council had written the emperor—(for they deposed Athanasius *in absentia*)—and because of which the emperor was displeased, being angry with Athanasius. And he lived in Italy for more than twelve or fourteen years.

10,1 Later it was widely reported that Arsenius, whom the traducers had originally reported as dead and whose hand was said to be cut off, had been found in Arabia, and that Arsenius had actually made himself known to Athanasius in exile.[21] And Pope Athanasius sent for him secretly, as I have been told; and when Arsenius had come in person to

---

16 Cf. Ath. Ap. Sec. 72.4.
17 Holl παρεισφέροντες, MSS παραχωρήσαντες.
18 Cf. their letters to Julius and Athanasius at Ath. Ap. Sec. 58.1–6.
19 Ath. Ap. Sec. 9.2.
20 Ath. Ap. Sec. 9.2.
21 Ath. Ap. Sec. 8.4–5; 72.2.

the blessed Athanasius himself, < they came > together to Constantine's sons, Constans and Constantius, Athanasius exhibited Arsenius alive and with two hands, and it became clear that his accusers were guilty not only of slander but of grave-robbing, because of the dead hand they used to carry around.[22] (2) And this made the whole thing ridiculous, and there was astonishment at such fabrication and so much of it, and no one had any idea of what to say of the accusers, the accused, and all the other things—which will take a great deal of time < if I choose > to tell even part of them.

10,3 But Constantine died, and Pope Athanasius < had become > very much at home, esteemed and welcome < at > Rome and all over Italy, and with the emperor himself and his sons, Constans and Constantius. After the death of Constantine the Great he was sent < to Alexandria* > by the two emperors, although Constantius was at Antioch and gave his consent < through > his representatives and by a letter < to Alexandria* >, as I know from the three emperors' < letters* > to the Alexandrians, and to Pope Athanasius himself.[23] (4) And once again he occupied his throne after his successor Gregory, < who > had been sent by the Arians while Athanasius was in exile.

11,1 But he was again intrigued against, to Constantius by Stephen, and expelled. And after that he was intrigued against once more, by the eunuch Leontius and his supporters. He incurred banishment then, and another recall. For George was sent [to Alexandria] by Constantius, and Athanasius withdrew and went into hiding for a while,[24] until George was killed, at which time Julian came to the throne and after Constantius' death reverted to Hellenism. (2) For the Alexandrians had nourished anger at George and they killed him, burned his body, reduced it to ashes, and scattered it to the winds. (3) But after Julian had died in Persia and the blessed Jovian had succeeded to the empire, he wrote to the bishop Athanasius with great honor and a memorable letter; and he sent for him, embraced him, and sent him to his own throne, and the holy church had received its bishop back and was comforted for a short while.

After Jovian's death the blessed Athanasius was once more assailed by the same persecutions, defamations and disturbances. (4) He was not, indeed, driven from the church and his throne; the Alexandrians had

[22] Cf. Ath. Ap. Sec. 64.1–69.4.
[23] Cf. Ath. Hist. Ar. 8.1–2; Ap. Sec. 64.1–69.4.
[24] Cf. Ath. Ap. De Fuga 2–3.

sent an embassy on his behalf, and the entire city had demanded him after Lucius, < who is > bishop now, had been consecrated abroad as the Arian < bishop of Alexandria >. It is likely that at Antioch, and a number of times, he had urged the emperor Valens that he be sent to the throne [of Alexandria], < but that the emperor* >, who was unwilling to expel Athanasius for fear of a disturbance among the people, < had not heeded him* >. (5) Indeed, Lucius was finally sent when Pope Athanasius died, and did much harm to church and city—to the laity, bishops and clergy who had been under Athanasius and had received him in every church, and to Peter, who had been consecrated as Athanasius' successor in Alexandria.

11,6 This is still the situation. Some have been exiled—bishops, presbyters and deacons—others have been subjected to capital punishment in Alexandria, and others sent to the arena; and virgins have been killed, and many others are perishing. (7) God's church is still in this plight because of the affair of the Melitians and Arians, who have used means of this sort to gain their foothold, and < the opportunity > for the same heretical gang, I mean the gang of Arians, to win out. (8) I shall discuss all this in detail in my refutation of Arius.

But I shall pass this subject by as well and go on to the Arian sect itself, calling on God for aid as I approach this fearful, many-headed serpent to battle with it.

Against the Arian Nuts[1] *49, but 69 of the series*

1,1 Arius and the Arians who derive from him came directly after this time of Melitius and St. Peter the bishop of Alexandria. Arius flourished during the episcopate of Peter's successor, the holy bishop Alexander, who deposed him amid much turmoil and with a great council. For Alexander removed him from office and expelled him from the church and the city, as a great evil which had come to the world. (2) They say that Arius was Libyan, but that he had become a presbyter in Alexandria. He

[1] The literary sources of this Sect include Arius' letters to Eusebius of Nicomedia (6,1–7) and Alexander of Alexandria (7,1–8,5); the beginning of Constantine's dubious Encyclical against Arius (cf. Ath. Nic. 40.1–2); Athanasius' *Apologia Secunda and Epistula Ad Serapionem De Morte Arii*. There may be some debt to Athanasius' *Orationes Contra Arium*. If there is another literary source it is probably an Arian tract or some compendium of Arian proof texts. The bulk of Epiphanius' refutation of Arianism clearly bears the marks of his own style and thought.

presided over the church called the Church of Baucalis. All the catholic churches in Alexandria < are > under one archbishop, and presbyters have been assigned to each particular church to meet the ecclesiastical needs of the residents whose < homes are* > near each church. These are also called quarters and lanes by the inhabitants of Alexandria.

1,3 Arius was born during the reign of the great and blessed emperor Constantine, the son of Constantius in his old age. Constantius was the son of the emperor Valerian, < who > himself had ruled jointly with Diocletian, Maximian and the others. (4) Everyone knows that Constantine, the father of Constantius, Constans and Crispus, was admirable in the practice of Christianity and the apostolic and prophetic faith of the fathers, which had not been adulterated in the holy churches until the time of Arius himself. But Arius managed to detach a large number [from the church.]

2,1 A spirit of Satan, as scripture says, entered this Arius who was Alexander's presbyter, and incited him to stir up the dust against the church—< just as > no small fire was lit from him, and it caught on nearly the whole Roman realm, especially the east. Even today his sect has not stopped battling against the true faith.

2,2 But at that time Arius was to all appearances a presbyter, and there were many fellow presbyters of his in each church. (There are many churches in Alexandria, including the recently built Caesarium, as it is called, which was originally the Adrianum and later became the Licinian gymnasium or palace. (3) But later, in Constantius' time, it was decided to rebuild it as a church. Gregory the son of Melitian, and Arian, began it, and the blessed Athanasius, the father of orthodoxy, finished it. It was burned in Julian's time, and rebuilt by the blessed bishop Athanasius himself. (4) But as I said there are many others, the one called the Church of Dionysius, and those of Theonas, Pierius, Serapion, Persaea, Dizya, Mendidius, Ammianus, and the church Baucalis and others.)

2,5 A presbyter named Colluthus served in one of these, Carpones in another, Sarmatas in another, and the aforesaid Arius, who was in charge of one of these churches. (6) It is plain that each of these caused some discord among the laity by his expositions, when, at the regular services, he taught the people entrusted to his care. Some were inclined to Arius, but others to Colluthus, others to Carpones, others to Sarmatas. Since each of them expounded the scripture differently in his own church, from their preference and high regard for their own presbyter some people called themselves Colluthians, and others called themselves Arians. (7) And in

fact Colluthus < too > taught some perversions, but his sect did not survive and was scattered immediately. And if only this were also true of Arius' insane faith, or better, unfaith—or better, wicked faith!

3,1 For in his later years he was inspired by vanity to depart from the prescribed path. He was unusually tall, wore a downcast expression and was got up like a guileful serpent, able to steal every innocent heart by his villainous outer show. For he always wore a short cloak and a dalmatic[2] was pleasant in his speech, and was constantly winning souls round by flattery. (2) For example, what did he do but lure all of seventy virgins away from the church at one time! And the word is that he drew seven presbyters away, and twelve deacons.[3] And his plague immediately spread to bishops, for he convinced Secundus of Pentapolis and others to be carried away with him. (3) But all this went on in the church without the knowledge of the blessed Alexander, the bishop, until Melitius, the bishop of Egypt from the Thebaid whom I mentioned, who was regarded as an archbishop himself—the affair of Melitius had not yet reached the point of wicked enmity. (4) Moved by zeal, then—he did not differ in faith, only in his show of would-be righteousness, < because of > which he did the world great harm himself, as I have explained. Well then, Melitius, the archbishop in Egypt but supposed to be under Alexander's jurisdiction, brought this to the attention of the archbishop Alexander. As I have said, Melitius was contemporary with the blessed bishop and martyr Peter.

3,5 When Melitius had given all this information about Arius—how he had departed from the truth, had defiled and ruined many, and had gradually weaned his converts away from the right faith—the bishop sent for Arius himself and asked whether what he had been told about him was true. (6) Arius showed neither hesitancy nor fear but brazenly coughed his whole heresy up from the first—as his letters show and the investigation of him at the time. (7) And so Alexander called the presbytery together, and certain other bishops who were there [at the time], and held an examination and interrogation of Arius. But since he would not obey the truth Alexander expelled him and declared him outcast in the city. But the virgins we spoke of were drawn away from the faith with him, and the clergy we mentioned, and a great throng of others.

---

[2] Both of these garments were sometimes worn by monks.
[3] Cf. Soc. 1.6.8; Soz. 1.15.7; Gel. 2.3.6; Theod. 1.4.61.

4,1 But though Arius stayed in the city for a long time, the confessor and martyr Melitius immediately died. Arius, then, destroyed many by instigating schisms and leading everyone astray. Later though, since he had been discovered and exposed in the city and excommunicated, he fled from Alexandria and made < his > way to Palestine. (2) And on his arrival he approached each bishop with fawning and flattery in the hope of gaining many supporters. And some received him, while others rebuffed him.

4,3 Afterwards this came to the ears of the bishop Alexander, and he wrote encyclical letters to each bishop which are still preserved by the scholarly, about seventy in all. He wrote at once to Eusebius in Caesarea—he was alive—and to Macarius of Jerusalem, Asclepius in Gaza, Longinus in Ascalon, Macrinus in Jamnia, and others; and in Phoenicia to Zeno, a senior bishop in Tyre, and others, along with < the bishops > in Coele Syria. (4) When the letters had been sent reproving those who had received Arius, each bishop replied to the blessed Alexander with his explanation. (5) And some wrote deceitfully, others truthfully, some explaining that they had not received him, others, that they had received him in ignorance, and others that they had done it to win him by hospitality. And this is a long story.

5,1 Later, when Arius found that letters had been sent to the bishops everywhere, and that afterwards he was turned away from every door and none but his sympathizers would take him in any more—(2) (for the elderly senior bishop of Nicomedia, Eusebius, was a sympathizer of his[4] together with Lucius, his colleague in Nicomedia. And so was Leontius, the eunuch in Antioch who had not yet been entrusted with the episcopate, and certain others. Since all of them belonged to the same noxious brotherhood, Eusebius sheltered him for some time). (3) And so at that time this Arius wrote and addressed letters full of all sorts of foolishness, which contained the whole of his heretical creed, to Eusebius in Nicomedia, this before he had come to him in Nicomedia, putting in them no more than what he really thought. I feel obliged to offer one of them here which has come into my hands, so that the readers can see that I have neither said nor am saying anything slanderous against anyone. Here is the letter:[5]

[4] Holl ὑπουργός, MSS χόρος.
[5] Cf. Theodoret Haer. 1.5.1–4.

6,1 *Greetings in the Lord from Arius, unjustly persecuted by Pope Alexander for the all-conquering truth of which you too are a defender, to the most beloved man of God, the faithful and orthodox Master Eusebius.*

6,2 *As my father Ammonius is arriving in Nicomedia it seems to me reasonable and proper to address you through him, at the same time recalling your characteristic love and [kindly] disposition toward the brethren for the sake of God and his Christ. For the bishop is harassing and persecuting us severely, and stirring up every sort of evil against us,* (3) *so that he has driven us from the city as godless men because we do not agree with his public declaration, "Always God, always a Son. Together with a Father, a Son. The Son co-exists with God without origination, ever begotten, begotten without origination. Not by a thought or a moment of time is God prior to the Son, [but] there is ever a God, ever a Son, the Son from God himself."* (4) *And as your brother in Caesarea, Eusebius, and Theodotus, Paulinus, Athanasius, Gregory, Aetius and all the bishops in the east say that God is prior to the Son without beginning, they have become anathema—except for the ignorant sectarians Philogonius, Hellanicus and Macarius, some of whom say that the Son is an eructation and others, an uncreated emanation.* (5) *And to these impieties we cannot even listen, not if the sectarians threaten us with a thousand deaths.*

6,6 *But what is it that we say and believe, and that we have taught and teach ? That the Son is not uncreated or in any respect part of an uncreated being, or made of anything previously existent. He was brought into being by the will and counsel [of God], before all times and before all ages, as unbegotten God in the fullest sense, and unalterable; and before he was begotten, created, determined or established, he did not exist.* (7) *But we are persecuted because we have said, "The Son has a beginning but God is without beginning." We are also persecuted because we have said, "He is made from nothing." But we have so said in the sense that he is not a part of God or made from any thing previously existent. It is for this reason that we are persecuted; the rest you know.*

I pray for your good health in the Lord, my true fellow Lucianist Eusebius; be mindful of my afflictions.

7,1 Moreover, I subjoin another letter written in supposed self-defense from Nicomedia by Arius to the most holy Pope Athanasius and sent by him to Alexandria. Once again it is filled, to an incomparably worse degree, with the blasphemous expressions of his venom. This is the letter:[6]

[6] Cf. Ath. Syn. 16.

7,2 *Greetings in the Lord from the presbyters and deacons to our blessed Pope and bishop, Alexander.*

7,3 *Our faith which we have received from our forefathers and learned from you as well, blessed Pope, is as follows. We know that one God, the only ingenerate, the only eternal, who alone is without beginning, only is the true God, alone has immortality, alone is wise, alone good, alone sovereign, alone judge with the governance and care of all, immutable and unalterable, just and good, < the Lord* > of the Law and Prophets and of the New Testament— that this God has begotten an only Son before eternal times,* (4) *and through him has made the ages and the rest. He has begotten him not in appearance but in truth and brought him into being, immutable and unalterable, by his own will;* (5) *God's perfect creature but not like any other creature; an offspring but not like any other offspring;* (6) *and not an emanation, as Valentinus believed the Father's offspring to be; nor as Mani represented the offspring as a co-essential part of the Father; nor like Sabellius, who, dividing the Unity, said "Son-Father"; nor as Hieracas called him a light kindled from a light, or a lamp become two;* (7) *nor priorly existent and later generated or created anew as a Son. You yourself, blessed Pope, have very often publicly denounced those who give these explanations in the church and assembly. But as we say, He is a Son created by the will of God before the times and ages, who has received his life, being and glory from the Father, the Father subsisting together with him. For by giving him the inheritance of all things the Father did not deprive himself of his possession of ingeneracy in himself, for he is the source of all.*

8,1 *Thus there are three entities, a Father, a Son and a Holy Spirit. And God, who is the cause of all, is the sole and only being without beginning. But the Son, who was begotten of the Father though not in time, and who was created and established before the ages, did not exist before his begetting but was alone brought into being before all things by the Father alone, not in time.* (2) *Nor is he eternal, or co-eternal and co-uncreated with the Father. Nor does he have a being simultaneous with the Father's, as some speak of things [which are naturally] related to something else, thus introducing two uncreateds. But God is before all as a Unit and the first principle of all things. And thus he is also before Christ, as we have learned from you when you have preached publicly < in > the church.*

8,3 *Thus, in that the Son has his being from God < who > has provided him with life, glory and all things, God is his first cause. For God is his ruler, as his God and prior to him in existence, because the Son originates from*

him. (4) *And if "out of the belly,*[7] *and "I came forth from the Father and am come,"* [8] *are taken by some to mean that he is part of a co-essential God and an emanation, the Father must be composite, divisible and mutable—and in their opinion the incorporeal God has a body and, given their premises, is subject to the consequences of corporeality. We pray for your good health in the Lord, blessed Pope.* (5) *Arius, Aeithales, Achillas, Carpones, Sarmatas, Arius, presbyters; the deacons Euzoeus, Lucius, Julius, Menas, Helladius, Gaius; the bishops Secundus of Pentapolis, Theonas of Libya, Pistus*—the bishop the Arians consecrated for Alexandria.

9,1 Now that matters had been stirred up in this way, Alexander wrote to the emperor Constantine. And the blessed emperor summoned Arius and certain bishops, and interrogated them. (2) But < with the support > of his co-religionists Arius at first denied the charge before the emperor, while inwardly hatching the plot against the church. And after summoning him the blessed Constantine, as though to some degree inspired < by > the Holy Spirit, addressed him saying, "I trust in God that if you are holding something back and denying it, the Lord of all has the power to confound you speedily, especially since it is by him that you have sworn." Hence Arius was indeed caught holding the same opinions, and was exposed before the emperor.

9,3 But he made a similar denial again, and many of his defenders petitioned the emperor for him through Eusebius of Nicomedia. But meanwhile the emperor was moved with zeal, and wrote a long circular against Arius and his creed to the whole Roman realm, filled with all sorts of wisdom and truthful sayings. (4) It is still preserved among the scholarly and begins, "The most high Augustus Constantine, to Arius and the Arians. A bad expositor is in very truth the image and representation of the devil."[9] (5) Then, after some other remarks and after giving a long refutation of Arius from the sacred scripture, he also indignantly directed a line from Homer against him and quoted it, and I feel that I must quote it here as well. (6) It goes, "Come now, Ares Arius, there is a need for shields. Do this not, we pray; let Aphrodite's speech restrain thee."[10]

---

[7] Ps 109:3.
[8] John 16:28.
[9] The entire letter, which may not actually be Constantine's, is found at Ath. Nic. 40.
[10] Ath. Syn. 40.6. The Homeric line is apparently a misquotation of Iliad 5.31.

10,1[11] Arius wished to be received back into the church in Constantinople, and Eusebius pressed for this and had great influence with the emperor, and kept pestering the bishop of Constantinople at that time. The bishop did not wish to be in the same fellowship with Arius or enter into communion with him, and was troubled and groaned, but Eusebius said, "If you won't do it by your own choice he'll come in with me tomorrow at the dawn of the Lord's Day, and what can you do about it?"

10,2 That most pious and godfearing bishop, Alexander, bishop of the best of cities—(he and the bishop in Alexandria had the same name)—spent the whole day after he heard that, and the night, in groans and mourning, praying and beseeching God either to take his life so that he would not be polluted by communion with Arius, or to work some wonder. And his prayer was answered. (3) Arius went out that night from the need to relieve himself, went to the privy, sat down in the stalls inside, and suddenly burst and expired. Thus, he was overtaken and surrendered his life in a smelly place, just as he had belched out a dirty heresy,

11,1 When this was over the emperor felt concerned for the church, because by now many members often differed with one another and there were many schisms. He therefore convened an ecumenical council, and the names of 318 bishops are preserved to this day. And they condemned Arius' creed in the city of Nicaea, and confessed the orthodox and unswerving creed of the fathers, which has been handed down to us from the apostles and prophets. (2) After the bishops had signed this and condemned the insane Arian sect, < peace* > was restored. They passed certain ecclesiastical canons at the council besides, and at the same time decreed with regard to the Passover that there must be one unanimous concord in the celebration of God's holy and most excellent day. For it was variously observed by people; some kept it early, some between [the disputed dates], but others, late. (3) And in a word, there was a great deal of controversy at that time. But through the blessed Constantine God directed the right ordering of these things for the sake of peace.

11,4 After Arius had been condemned and these measures taken Alexander died that same year after Achillas had succeeded him, but Theonas was consecrated too, by the Melitians. Then the blessed Athanasius succeeded Achillas after he had been bishop for three months.[12] Athana-

[11] For the story that follows see Ath. Ep. Ser. Mort. Ar.

[12] Athanasius was actually consecrated a month and a half after Achillas' death. Epiphanius may be misinterpreting Ath. Apol. Sec. 59.3, which refers, not to the time of

sius was Alexander's deacon at that time, and had been sent by him to court; as Alexander's death approached he had ordered that the episcopate be conferred on Athanasius. (5) But the custom at Alexandria is that the consecrators do not delay after the death of a bishop; < the consecration* > is held at once for the sake of peace, to avoid conflicts among the laity with some for one candidate and some for another. (6) Since Athanasius was not there they were forced to consecrate Achillas. But the throne belonged to the person called by God and designated by the blessed Alexander, and the priesthood was prepared for him.

11,7 Thus Athanasius arrived and was consecrated. He was very much a zealot for the faith and a protector of the church, and by now there were [schismatic] services everywhere, and a splinter group of laity formed by the so-called Melitians, for the reason I gave in my piece on Melitius. In his desire to achieve the unification of the church Athanasius accused, threatened, admonished, and no one would listen. (8) This was the reason for all the intrigues and plots against him, the extremity of his God-given zeal. And so he was subjected to banishments too because of his excommunication by the Arians with the highly unjust secular power. (9) But enough about the blessed Athanasius. His story has been told in full detail in the above description of Melitius.

12,1 Now Arius was infused with the power of the devil, and wagged his tongue against his own Master with shameless impudence—originally from his supposed desire to expound the words of Solomon in his Proverbs, "The Lord created me a beginning of his ways. Before the age he set me up in the beginning, before he made the earth, before he made the depths, before the springs of waters came forth, before the mountains were settled, before all hills he begot me."[13] (2) This became the introduction of his error; neither < he himself > nor his disciples were ashamed to call the creator of all things, the Word begotten of the Father without beginning and not in time, a creature.

12,3 But then, on the basis of this one passage, he directed his malignant mind into many evil paths, < he himself > and his successors, and they set out to utter ten thousand blasphemies and more against the Son of God and the Holy Spirit. (4) They broke the front, as it were, and concord of the holy, orthodox faith and church, [though] not by their own

---

Athanasius' consecration, but to the time between the Council of Nicaea and the death of the bishop Alexander. With Epiphanius' account cf. Theod. 1.26.1.

[13] Prov 8:22–25; Cf. Ath. Nic. 13; C. Ar. 53.

power or wisdom. The deluded people who were [truly] inclined to join them were few, but many gradually came in from hypocrisy; and many, besides, were forced into communion with them because they had < no way to resist* >. And no one < of sound faith* > was their agent, but the care< less >ness of the faithful first, and the protection of emperors.

12,5 The beginning < came with > the emperor Constantius, who was a meek and good man in all other respects and who, as the son of the great and perfect Constantine with his piety and unwavering observance of the right faith, was pious himself, and good in many ways. (6) But he was mistaken only in this matter, his failure to follow the faith of his fathers—not by his own fault, but because of those who will give account at the day of judgment, the bishops in appearance, so-called, but corrupters of God's true faith. (7) These must give account, both for the faith and for the persecution of the church, and the many wrongs and murders that have been committed in the churches because of them; and for the vast numbers of laity who still today are suffering affliction under the open sky; and for Constantius of blessed memory himself who, since he did not know the orthodox faith, was led astray by them and in his ignorance deferred to them as priests. For he was not aware of the eror of the blindness and heresy in them which was caused by the devil's plot.

13,1 Secondly, their gang of snakes gained further strength through Eudoxius, who wormed his way into the confidence of the most pious and God-loving emperor Valens and, once again, corrupted his ear.[14] The reason they could maintain their position was Valens' baptism by Eudoxius. (2) Otherwise < they would have been refuted > long ago even by women and kids—never mind the more mature, who understand all the exact terms of godliness and right faith, but even by anyone with any partial glimmer of understanding of the truth—and, since they were refuted by the ancients, they would have been harried as blasphemers of the Master, as second killers of the Lord and despisers of the divine protection of our Lord Jesus Christ. (3) But by the emperor's patronage, that is, his protection of them, < they are in the ascendent >, so as to put into effect all the wrongs that have been and are still being done by them at Alexandria, Nicomedia, Mesopotamia and Palestine, under the patronage of the same, current emperor.

[14] Cf. Socr. 4.1.6; Soz. 4.6.10; Theod. 4.12.4.

14,1 All the rest of their teachings are contrived from this verse in Proverbs, "The Lord created me the beginning of his ways, for his works."[15] And < they gather > every possible agreement and equivalent to this text < from the scriptures >, and everything that could be in accord with it, although neither the text itself nor the other passages say anything of the sort about the divinity of the Son of God. (2) All the same, anything like this—the text in the Apostle, "Receive ye the high priest of your profession, who is faithful to him that made him";[16] and < the one > in John's Gospel, "He it is of whom I said unto you that he that cometh after me *hath come into being*[17] before me";[18] and the one in Acts, "Be it be known unto all you house of Israel that God hath made this Jesus whom ye crucified both Lord and Christ,"[19] and others like these—wherever < they find some text* > of note < they collect it* > as a defense against their foes. (3) For they are indeed foes and conspirators. "Let God arise and let his foes be scattered"[20] might well have been written of them and their kind. They appear to be members of our household—there is nothing worse than foes of one's own household, for "A man's foes are all the men of his household."[21] And this too probably applies to them.

15,1 For they leap up like savage dogs to repel their foes and say, "What do you say of the Son of God?" (For these are their devices for introducing their poison to the simple.)

"And what more can there be after this, after one calls him the Son of God, you folks who are 'wise in your own eyes and prudent in their sight,'[22] and give the appearance of knowledgeability? What more can one add to the name of Jesus, other than to say that he is true Son, of the Father and not different from him?"

15,2 Then they scornfully jump right up and say, "How can he be 'of God?' " And if you ask them, "Isn't he the Son?" they confess the sonship in name but deny it in force and meaning and simply want to call him a bastard, not a real son. "For if he is of God," they say, "and if God as it were begot < a Son > from himself, from his actual substance or his

---

15 Prov 8:22.

16 Heb 3:1–2. Cf. Ath. Or. I C. Ar. 53; Or. II C. Ar. 6; 10; De Sent. Dion. 10–11 (PG 25, 493B, 496B).

17 γέγονε.

18 John 1:15.

19 Acts 2:36. Cf. Ath. Or. I C. Ar. 53; Or. 2 C. Ar. 11–12.

20 Ps 67:2.

21 Matt 10:36.

22 Isa 5:11.

own essence—well then, he swelled, or was cut, or was expanded or contracted in begetting him, or underwent some physical suffering."[23]

And they are simply ridiculous to compare their own characteristics with God's, and draw a parallel between God and themselves.[24] (4) There can be nothing of the kind in God. "God is spirit"[25] and has begotten the Only-begotten of himself ineffably, inconceivably and spotlessly.

15,5 "If he is of his essence then," they say, "why doesn't he know the day and the hour, as he says, 'But of that day or that hour knoweth no man, neither the angels, neither the Son, but the Father only?'[26] And if he is 'of the Father,' how could he become flesh?' How could that nature which cannot be contained put on flesh, if by nature he were of the Father?"

16,1 And they do not know how they are gathering these calculations together to their own shame. For if he took flesh, and suffered and was crucified in it because he was different from the Father's essence, they should tell us which other spiritual beings donned flesh even though they were creatures. For they cannot help admitting that the Son is superior to all. Even if they call him a creature, they admit that he is superior to all his creatures.

16,2 Indeed, they want to flatter him as though they were doing him a favor—as though they were striking him with one hand but anointing him with the other. For they wish to make this concession to him as though by their own choice, and say, "We call him a creature, but not like any other creature; a product of creation, but not like any other product; and an offspring, but not like any other offspring."[27] This to deprive him of the begetting which by nature is proper to him by saying, "not like any other offspring," and declare him a true creature by saying, "not like any other creature."

16,3 Whatever a creature may be, it is a creature. Even though its name is any number of times more exalted it is just the same as all creatures.[28] The sun cannot not be a creature just like a rock even though it is brighter than the rest. Nor, because the moon outshines the stars, is it for this reason not one of the creatures. "Behold, all things are thy servants."[29]

---

[23] Cf. Ath. Or. I 16; 28.
[24] Cf. Ath. Or. I 16; 28.
[25] John 4:24.
[26] Mark 13:32; Matt 24:36. Cf. Ath. Or. Ill C. Ar. 26.
[27] Athanasius quotes this at Or. II 19.
[28] For a similar argument see the Letter of Marcellus, Pan. 73,4,6–7; Ath Or. II 20.
[29] Ps 118:91.

16,4 But the Only-begotten is truth and his word is true, as he said, "If ye continue in my word ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."[30] But if his word is truth and frees the souls whom he sets free, how much more is he himself free—since he is truth, and sets his believing servants free! For all things are his servants, and his Father's, and the Holy Spirit's.

17,1 Then again they say, "How could he come in the flesh, if he was of the Father's essence?" [Is it not true that] angels, who are his servants, have not taken flesh? Archangels? Hosts? All the other spiritual beings? (2) But they say too that the Spirit is even more inferior, and is the creature of a creature, since he is < the product > of the Word. Why did the Spirit not take flesh then, since, on Arius' premises, he can have a face more changeable than the Son's? But since the Son was the Father's wisdom he consented, by his own perfection, to assume our weakness, so that all salvation would come to the world through him. (3) But people who turn good things to bad are ungrateful—ungrateful, unwise, insulters and blasphemers of their own Master.

And whatever else they say, in the last analysis they mean it as a detraction of him. "If he was of the Father's essence, why was he hungry? Scripture says too that God 'shall not hunger or thirst, nor is there any finding out of his counsel.'[31] But Christ was hungry and thirsty. Why did he tire from his journey and sit down, < when scripture says > that God 'shall not weary?[32] (4) And why did he say, "The Father that hath sent me is greater than I?'[33] The sender is one person, the sent, another."

And it is plain that the Father is not the Son, and the Son is not the Father. We do not talk like Sabellius, who says that he is the Son-Father. (5) If he had not said, "Another is he that hath sent me,"[34] and, "I go unto my God and your God, unto my Father and your Father,"[35] < the disciples would have believed that he himself was the Father. < This is why* > he said, < "My God." But he said, "your God," because* > his disciples were begotten < only by grace* >, and not by nature from the essence of God. < This is why > he said, "*your* Father," to them.

---

[30] John 8:31–32.
[31] Isa 40:28.
[32] Cf. Isa 40:28.
[33] John 14:28.
[34] Cf. John 5:32; 36.
[35] John 20:17.

17,6 But people who say such things are just cracked. If he is called the Son in name only and is not the Son by nature, he is no different from all the other creatures even if he is of superior rank. Because the emperor outranks his governors and generals, this does not mean that he does not have the same limitations as the rest, and is not their fellow servant of the same creation, since he is mortal, just as his subjects are. (7) And because the sun surpasses the other stars, and the moon does to an extent, this does not mean that they are not heavenly bodies subordinate [to God], and subject to the ordinance of the one creator and maker, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. (8) And because angels surpass the visible creatures and, in comparison with the rest, are the greatest of all—for they were created invisible, enjoy the supreme privilege of serving God with continual hymns, are immortal by grace though not by nature, and yet have been vouchsafed a natural immortality by him who in himself is life and immortality—[all] this does not mean that they do not serve with fear and trembling, accountable and answerable to the holy Godhead, and subject to his bidding and command.

18,1 This will help us < understand* > the exact nature of the truth we are after: to say, "Son," but say it without considering him a son in name only, but say that the Son is a son by nature. With us too, many are called sons without being sons by nature. But our real sons are called "true"; they were actually begotten by us. (2) And if he was only called a son, as indeed all have been called sons of God, he is no different from the rest. And why is he worshiped as God? On Arius' premises all the other things that have been given the title of sons should be worshiped, since they are termed sons of God. (3) But this is not the truth. The truth at all times knows one only-begotten Son of God whom all things serve and worship, and to whom "every knee shall bow, of things in heaven and things in earth and things under the earth, and every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father."[36]

18,4 But neither is the Holy Spirit equivalent to the other spirits since the Spirit of God is one, a Spirit that proceeds from the Father and receives of the Son. Arians, though, make him a creature of a creature. For they say, " 'All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made.'[37] (5) Therefore," they say, "the Holy Spirit is a creature too, since '*all* things were made by him.' "

[36] Phil 2:10–11.
[37] John 1:3.

And those who have lost their own souls for no good reason do not know that created beings are one thing, and that < un >created beings—Father, Son and Holy Spirit, one God, Trinity in truth and Unity in oneness—are another. (6) This is the reason that God is one: there are not two Fathers, or two Sons or two Holy Spirits, and the Son is not different from the Father but begotten of him, and the Holy Spirit is not different. But the Son is only-begotten, without beginning < and > not in time. And the Holy Spirit, as the Father himself and the Only-begotten know, is neither begotten nor created, nor alien to the Father and Son; "he anointed Christ with the Holy Spirit."[38] If the Only-begotten is himself anointed with the Spirit, who can bring a charge against the Holy Trinity?

19,1 Then again the insane Arius says, "Why did the Lord say, 'Why callest thou me good? One is good, God' "[39] as though himself denying his own goodness?" (2) Because they are soulish and fleshly, are discerned by the Holy Spirit and devoid of him, and lack the gift of the Holy Spirit which gives wisdom to all, they do not know God's power and goodness, or the dispensation of God's wisdom.

19,3 "Again," says Arius, "the sons of Zebedee asked him through their mother if one of them might sit at his right and one at his left in his kingdom, and he told them, 'Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink the cup that I shall drink of? And when they said, Yea, he said unto them, Ye shall drink of my cup, but to sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give, but is for them for whom it is prepared of the Father.'[40] (4) Then the apostle says, 'God raised him from the dead,[41] as though he needed someone to raise him. And it says in the Gospel according to Luke, 'There appeared an angel of the Lord strengthening him when he was in agony, and he sweat; and his sweat was as it were drops of blood,' when he went out to pray before his betrayal.[42] (5) And again, on the cross he said, 'Eli, Eli, lema sabachthani, that is, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me.'[43] And do you see," says Arius, "how he is in need of help?"

19,6 But as to his words, "I am in the Father and the Father in me,"[44] < they cite >, "We two are one, that they also may be one,"[45] "And do

[38] Acts 10:38.
[39] Mark 10:18; Matt 20:28. Cf. Marcellus of Ancyra, Inc. 1.7.
[40] Cf. Matt 20:20–23.
[41] Rom 10:9. Cf. Marcellus of Ancyra Inc. 1.7.
[42] Cf. Luke 22:43–44; Ath. Or. Ill 26.54.
[43] Matt 27:46; cf. Ath. Or. III.
[44] John 14:10.
[45] John 17:22.

you see," he says, "that we too shall be one *as the Father and the Son are one*."* > Thus he is not speaking of a oneness by nature, but of a oneness of concord."

19,7 But not only this; they also deny that he has received a human soul, and do so deliberately.[46] For they confess that he has true flesh from Mary, and everything human *except* for a soul. Thus, when you hear of his hunger, thirst, weariness, journeying, sweat, sleep or anger, and say that he needed these because of his human nature, they will tell you afterwards that flesh does not do these things of itself unless it has a soul. (8) And in fact, this is true. "What can this mean," they say, "except that his 'divine nature' had needs?"—so that, when they say that his "divine nature" had needs, they can declare that he is alien to and different from his Father's true essence and nature.

19,9 I believe, however, that from one, two, or five of their poorly chosen, refuted and exploded proof texts < I can make the whole of their villainy plain* > to everyone[47] who has understanding. And since the whole truth is proclaimed, and plainly confirmed, in the faith of orthodoxy, < I trust that* > even if they cite a million other texts besides these contrived expositions, the Arians will stand convicted in the eyes of those people who have godly good sense. For since they mean the same, most of these will be refuted in [the refutation of] these few.

20,1 And I shall start my argument first with the place where Arius began the evil planting of their bitter root, the words of Solomon, The Lord created me the beginning of his ways, for his works."[48] (2) And scripture nowhere confirmed, nor did any apostle ever mention this text to apply it to the name of Christ. Thus Solomon is not speaking of the Son of God at all, even if he says, "I, wisdom, have given counsel and knowledge a home, and I have summoned judgment"[49] (3) How many "wisdoms" are loosely called God's? But there is one Only-begotten, and he is not given that name catachrestically, but in truth.

For all things are God's wisdom, and whatever is from God is wisdom. (4) But the unique, supreme Wisdom is something else—that is, the Only-begotten, He who is called wisdom, not loosely but in truth, He who is

---

[46] Cf. Ps.-Ath. C. Apollin. 2.3; Theod. Haer. Fab. 4.1; Eustathius 18.

[47] Drexl and MSS τῷ σύνεσιν κεκτημένῳ, MSS παντί τῳ . . .

[48] Prov 8:22. This is quoted as an Arian proof text at Ath. Or. I 53, but given no particular emphasis.

[49] Prov 8:12.

always with the Father, "the power of God and the wisdom of God."[50] But "The poor man's wisdom is despised";[51] and, "since in the wisdom of God the world knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of the Gospel to save them that believe";[52] and, "God hath made foolish the wisdom of this world";[53] And, "God gave to Solomon an heart like the sand of the sea, and made him wiser than the sons of Ana";[54] and, "God gave wisdom to Bezaleel, and God filled Uri with wisdom."[55]

20,5 And there is a great deal to say about wisdom, and "Where is the place of understanding, and where can wisdom be found?"[56] Even though the renowned wisdom says, "I, wisdom, have given counsel and knowledge a home, and I have summoned judgment. By me kings reign, and through me princes are great, rulers write righteousness, and despots possess the earth. (6) I love them that love me, and they that seek me shall find me. Wealth and glory are mine, and the possession of many goods, and righteousness. I walk in the way of righteousness, and I tread in the midst of right paths, to apportion substance to them that love me, and fill their treasures with goods. (7) If I tell you the incidents of each day, I shall remember to recount the happenings from everlasting. The Lord created me the beginning of his ways, for his works. Before the age he established me in the beginning, before he made the earth and before he made the deeps, before fountains of water came forth, before mountains were founded and before all hills he begat me,"[57] and so on—(8) [even so], since there are some who want to dispute the passage, our opponents will obviously reply by citing the term, "wisdom," and the sequel to it, 'The Lord created me," together with, "I, wisdom, have given counsel a home." "See here," < they will say >, "wisdom gave her own name at the outset and, as she went on in order, indicated herself when she said, 'The Lord created me.' (9) See, she says, 'I, wisdom,' above; and below she says, 'If I tell you the happenings of each day, I shall remember to recount the things from everlasting.' And what does she mean [by the 'happenings from everlasting']? 'The Lord *created* me the beginning of his ways.' "

---

50 1 Cor 1:24.
51 Eccles 9:16.
52 1 Cor 1:21.
53 1 Cor 1:20.
54 3 Kms 4:25; 27.
55 Exod 31:2.
56 Job 28:12.
57 Prov 8:12; 15–18; 20–25.

21,1 I have said that many things which < are > loosely < termed > wisdoms have been given by God from time to time, since God does all things with wisdom. But there is one true wisdom of the Father, the subsistent divine Word. For the word ["wisdom"] itself (i.e., at Prov. 8:22) by no means compels me to speak of the Son of God; < scripture > did not make that clear, nor did any of the apostles mention it, and not the Gospel either. (2) But if it were taken of the Son of God—the word [in itself] is not the same [as "Son"], and does not lend itself to an immediate judgment [as to whether it means "Son" at this point].

For the book is entirely proverbs. And nothing in a proverb has the same meaning [that it usually does]; it is described verbally in one way, but intended allegorically with another meaning. (3) If Solomon says this, however, and some venture to apply it to the Son of God—never! The word is not a reference to his Godhead. (4) But if it can be applied to Christ's human nature—for "Wisdom hath builded her house"[58]—and if it can therefore be piously spoken in the person of Christ's human nature,[59] as though his human nature were saying, "The Lord created me" of his Godhead—(that is, "the Lord built me in Mary's womb")—"as the beginning of his ways for his works," [then wisdom might indeed mean "Son" here.][60] (5) For the beginning of the "ways" of Christ's descent into the world is the body he took from Mary in his "work" of righteousness and salvation.

But some crackbrain who is struck with this frightful plague and has enmity for the Son of God in his heart will be sure to rush forward and say, (6) "He said, 'If I tell you the incidents of each day, I shall remember to recount the happenings from everlasting.'[61] And you see that he says, 'from everlasting.' But according to Matthew God's incarnation came after seventy-two generations; how can 'from everlasting' be said by the human nature?" (22,1) And those who have strayed entirely off the road of the truth do not realize that whatever the sacred scripture wishes to teach, < if > it is beginning an exposition it does not go straight to the oldest data and, as it were, the main point, but begins with the events nearest at hand in order to show last of all what came first. (2) For this is why it said, "If I tell you the incidents of each day," [first], but afterwards," I < shall > also

[58] Prov 9:1.
[59] So Athanasius, much more confidently, at Nic. 14.2–4.
[60] Prov 8:21a.
[61] Prov 8:21a.

recount the things from everlasting."[62] So God showed Moses the burning bush first, and the vision in the first instance was that of a bush on fire. And an angel spoke to him immediately, but later the Lord spoke to him from the bush.

22,3 But Moses did not ask him straight off about what he had seen, but inquired about things in the distant past. For God said, "Come, I send thee to the children of Israel, and thou shalt say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob,"[63]—naming Abraham and the others, five or six generations before Moses. And since he had said "the God of your fathers" he had declared something ancient to him. (4) But Moses, with God-given understanding, was not asking about this but about something even more ancient: "If I go unto them and they say to me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them?"[64] and then he revealed his name: "I am He Who Is."[65] (5) And he had begun first with the things nearest in time, but last of all revealed what was furthest in the past.

Luke too begins with things that are later and nearest in time, "And Jesus began to be about thirty years of age, being, as was supposed, the son of Joseph, the son of Eli, the son of Matthan, the son of Nathan, the son of David, the son of Judah, the son of Jacob, the son of Abraham, the son of Nahor, the son of Noah, the son of Lamech, the son of Enoch, the son of Seth, the son of Adam, the son of God."[66] And you see how he spoke of the incarnation first, and then the [things he says] last.

22,6 And so when Matthew, in the fleshly genealogy, wished to remind people of Christ's human nature, he did not say at once, "The birth of Jesus Christ the son of Abraham." He said "son of David" first and then "son of Abraham," indicating the sight most lately seen and the most recent happening and [then] one still further in the past, to show the indispensability of what is still higher above all creation.

23,1 And so, when the blessed John came and found people preoccupied with Christ's human nature on earth, with the Ebionites gone wrong because of < Mathew's > tracing of Christ's earthly genealogy from Abraham and Luke's carrying of it back to Adam—and the Cerinthians and Merinthians, saying that he was conceived sexually as a mere man, and

---

62 Prov 8:21a.
63 Exod 3:10;15.
64 Exod 3:13.
65 Exod 3:14.
66 Luke 3:23–38.

the Nazoraeans and many other sects,—(2) John, as though coming along behind them (he was the fourth evangelist) began to recall them from their wandering, as it were, and their preoccupation with Christ's coming below. As though following behind and seeing that some were pointed towards rough, steep paths and had left the straight, true road, he began, as it were, to say to them, "Where are you headed? Where are you going, you who are taking that rough road full of obstacles and leading to a pit? (3) That isn't so! Turn back! The divine Word begotten of the Father on high does not date only from Mary. He is not from the time of Joseph her betrothed. He is not from the time of Shealtiel, Zerubbabel, David, Abraham, Jacob, Noah and Adam. '*In the beginning* was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.' "[67]

23,4 The word, "was," followed by "was" and followed by another "was," admits of no "was not." And you see, first of all, how scripture gave the most recent events at once—how Matthew showed the way with the genealogy and still did not give < all > the precise facts himself, though he surely carried the genealogy into the past. And Mark < described > the events in the world, a voice crying in the wilderness, < and > the Lord who was foretold by the Prophets and Law. And Luke traced him from the most recent times back to the earliest, < But later John, coming fourth, made the crowning touch manifest, and the perfection of the order on high and the eternal Godhead. (5) In the same way Solomon in his proverb < first indicated* > the beginning of the ways—(if, indeed, some may wish to say with piety that, since his Godhead itself had made the flesh and human nature as "the beginning of his ways for his works"[68] of men's salvation and his own goodness)--his incarnate self, since it says itself of Christ's Godhead, "The Godhead itself founded the house,"[69] and immediately afterwards, as the topic develops, says, "He founded me in the beginning."

23,6 Was the Son of God really created, and later established, in his divine nature? The clever folks, the observers of heaven, had better tell me the art by which wisdom was created, the tool with which it was established. But if it is allowable even to conceive of it, let us flee from such profound blasphemy, to keep our hands off the divine nature of the Only-begotten, which is always with the Father and has been begotten of him. (7) For < the > Lord was the Word, always with the Father, always wisdom,

[67] John 1:1.
[68] Prov 8:22.
[69] Prov 8:23.

always God of God, true and not spurious light, always deriving his being from the Father, and always truth and life.

24,1 And why should I say so much about this? He then says, "He established me in the beginning."[70] The godly can therefore see that here he means the human soul. (2) For the incarnate human nature says, "The Lord created me,"[71]—if, indeed, it should be taken in this way. "He established,"[72] however, should be taken in the sense that he was established in the soul. But "Before all hills he begot me,"[73] is meant to show that his begetting is from on high.

And I have said these things, by no means to insist on them, but as a devout way of understanding the passage as a reference to the human nature. (3) Even though I must speak in this way, no one can ever make me say that this passage refers to Christ. But it if is to be said of Christ, there indeed is its meaning, not obtained by guesswork but in accord with the piety of the thought, so as not to attribute any deficiency to the Son < or > suppose that he has a Godhead which is inferior to the Father's essence. (4) For some of our fathers, and orthodox,[74]—if indeed we must speak in this way of "The Lord created me and established me"[75]—have interpreted this by taking it of the human nature. And < because > this is a pious thought many important fathers have taught it. (5) And if one should not wish to accept the teaching of the orthodox [on this point], he will not be compelled to and it will do no harm to those who are strangers to the faith and pagans.

For neither will < the fact that Christ suffered* > for us entail any deficiency in < the Son >; his Godhead is free [from suffering] and is always with the Father. (6) Christ suffered whatever he suffered, but was not changed in nature; his Godhead retained its impassibility. Thus, when he willed of his own good pleasure to suffer for humanity—since the Godhead, which is impassible in itself, cannot suffer—he took our passible body since he is Wisdom, consented to suffering in it and taking our sufferings upon him in the flesh, accompanied by the Godhead.

---

70 Prov 8:23.
71 Prov 8:22.
72 Prov 8:23.
73 Prov 8:25.
74 For example, Athanasius?
75 Prov 8:22; 23.

For the Godhead does not suffer. (7) How can the One who said, "I am the life,"[76] die? God remains impassible but shares the sufferings of the flesh so that, even though Godhead does not suffer, the suffering may be counted as the Godhead's and our salvation may be in God. The suffering is in the flesh that we may have, not a passible but an impassible God who counts the suffering as his own, not of necessity but by his own choice.

25,1 But anyway, neither have these people examined the Hebrew expressions, or found out or < understood > what they mean, and yet they have willfully and rashly risen up as deadly foes, looking for a chance to mutilate the faith—or themselves, rather, for they can't mutilate the truth. And since they have found "The Lord created me," they recklessly dream as though they were having hallucinations, bringing mankind things that are of no use, and disturbing the world. (2) This is not what the Hebrew means, and so Aquila says, "The Lord got me." Men who have sired children always say, "I have gotten a son."

But neither did Aquila render the meaning. "I have gotten a son" implies something new, but in God there can be nothing new. (3) Even if one confesses that the Son has been begotten of the Father and not created, he was begotten without time and without beginning. (4) For there can be no time between the Father and the Son, or there will be some time < previous > to the Son's. For if all things are made through him, so are the times. (5) But if there is a time before Him who is before all—how can there be? But if there is, then we shall need another Son, through whom the time before the Son has been made.

And there are many things which lead into endless perplexity the minds of those people who "are always busy but do nothing good."[77] (6) In the Hebrew it says, "Adonai" (which means, "the Lord") "kanani," which can be rendered both "hatched[78] me" and "got me." In the strictest sense, however, it means, "hatched me." And which hatchling is not begotten from the substance of its begetter? And here, among bodily creatures, the young are produced by the pairings of male and female—from men to cattle, birds and all the rest. (7) And so, since the Only-begotten was in all respects the Father's wisdom and willed to do all things for our correction, so that no one would form a false notion of him and be deprived of the truth, he was not conceived from a man's seed when he made his home

[76] John 11:25.
[77] 2 Thes 3:11.
[78] The verb is not elsewhere attested but cf. Hebrew קֵן, "nest."

in the human race, when he was truly born of a woman and lay in the Virgin's womb during the period of gestation. Otherwise his birth in the flesh might have required pairing and sexual congress. But he took flesh only from his mother and yet made his human nature complete in his own image—not deficient, but true human nature.

25,8 And his not being of a man's seed did not make him deficient. He to whom all things belong took all things in their perfection: flesh, sinews, veins and everything else; a soul, truly and not in appearance; a mind; and all other human characteristics except for sin, as scripture says, "He was in all points tempted as a man, apart from sin."[79] (9) Thus, by being born in the flesh here simply of a mother, perfectly man and without defect, he would show those who desire to see the truth and not blind their own minds that on high he has been perfectly begotten of a Father on high, without beginning and not in time; and below has been born of a mother only, without spot or defilement.

26,1 But to explain the phrase, "Adonai kanani," which means, "The Lord hatched me." Whatever begets, begets its like. A man begets a man and God begets God, the man physically and God spiritually. (2) And as is the man who begets, so is the man who is begotten of him. The human begetter, who is subject to suffering, < begets > his own son, and the impassible God begot the Son who was begotten of him without suffering—begot him truly and not in appearance, of himself and not from outside himself, impassible spirit impassibly begetting spirit, impassible God impassibly begetting very God.

26,3 For if he created all things himself—and you admit, Arius, that God has created all things—then he also begot the Son himself. (4) But if you say, "If he begot, he suffered in begetting," we will say to you that if he suffered in begetting he tired from creating. But all that he wills, he has simultaneously perfected in himself; the Godhead will not bring suffering on the Son in the process of creation; nor can the Godhead be conceived of as suffering because of its spotless begetting of the Son. For the Father is unchangeable, the Son is unchangeable, the Holy Spirit is unchangeable, one essence, one Godhead.

26,5 But you are sure to ask me, "Did God beget the Son by willing to or without willing to?" And I am not like you, you troublemaker, to think any such thing of God. "If he begot him without willing to, he begot him unwillingly. And if he begot him willingly, the will came before the Son,

[79] Cf. Heb 4:15.

and because of the will there will be at least a moment of time between the Son [and the Father]." (6) But in God there is no time to will and no will to think. God begot the Son neither by willing to nor without willing to, but begot him in his nature which transcends will. For his is the nature of Godhead, which neither needs a will nor does anything without a will, but of itself possesses all things at once and is in want of nothing.

27,1 But Arius ferrets out still more texts, always wandering over everything and fussing with unsound arguments—not as the sacred text is, but as he < conceives of it > in his unhealthy preoccupation with controversies and verbal disputes which are good for nothing except his own ruin and his dupes'. < And > he seizes on the text where the Lord blessed his disciples and said, "Father, grant them to have life in themselves. And this is life eternal, that they know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."[80] (2) But I have already dealt with all this in my long work on the faith which, in my mediocrity and feebleness, I have been compelled to write about faith at the urgent request of the brethren, and have called the *Ancoratus*.[81] (3) And as, with God's help, my poor mind was able to gather the truths of God's teaching from every scripture—like an anchor for those who wish < to hold onto > the holy apostolic and prophetic faith of our fathers which has been preached in God's holy church from the beginning until now—I have set it out clearly for our minds to grasp and be certain of, < so that > they will not be shaken by the devil's devices or damaged by the seas which, by the sects with their bluster, have been raised in the world.

27,4 For the Lord taught his own disciples, "If what ye have heard from the beginning abide in you, and what ye have heard < of me >[82] abide in you, ye shall abide in me and I in you, and I in the Father and ye in me."[83] (5) Thus the truths of the faith, which we have heard from the Lord since the beginning, abide in God's holy church, (6) and God's holy church and orthodox faith thus abide in the Lord; and the Lord, the Only-begotten, abides in the Father, and the Father in the Son, and we in him through the Holy Spirit, provided we become temples to hold his Holy Spirit. (7) As God's holy apostle said, "Ye are the temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwelleth in you."[84] Thus the Spirit is God of God; and through God's Holy

---

[80] Cf. John 17:2–3.
[81] Cf. Anc. 71,3.
[82] Holl: παῤ ἐμοῦ, MSS: ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.
[83] 1 John 1:1; John 15:4; 10; 17:21.
[84] 1 Cor 3:16.

Spirit we are called temples, if we give his Spirit a home within us. For, < the > Spirit is the Spirit of Christ who proceeds < from > the Father and receives of the Son, as the Only-begotten himself confesses.

28,1 I have discussed all this in that book of mine about faith—the book which, as I said, I wrote to Pamphylia and Pisidia.[85] But here, since I have come to the debated expressions one after another, I have had diligently to make the same points over again, as it were, because of Arius, the heresiarch with whom we are dealing, and the Arians who derive from him—to demolish their wicked arguments which turn "sweet to bitter, good to evil, and light to darkness."[86] (2) For through the holy Isaiah "Woe" is definitively pronounced by the Lord upon such people, who turn good to evil. And God is in no way responsible for their kind. From pride, prejudice, would-be wisdom or devilish conceit, each of them has been deprived of the truth and, with his unsound teaching, brought an affliction on the world.

28,3 All right, let's take up this text in order to understand the words the Lord has spoken, as the holy apostle says, "We also have the Spirit of God, that we may know the things that God hath bestowed upon us, which things we likewise speak."[87] (4) For the Lord says, "Grant them to have life in themselves. And this is life eternal, that they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."[88]

29,1 Now this trouble-maker, Arius, and his followers jump up and say, "His praying to God at all, and saying, 'Father, grant them to have life in themselves,' shows that he is not the equal of the Giver of the life. If he were of the Father's essence he would give the life himself, and not ask the Father to give it to those who receive the gifts he gives in answer to their requests."

29,2 And the people who have turned their minds against themselves do not realize that the Only-begotten came to be our example and salvation in every way, and took his stand in the world like an athlete in an arena, to destroy all that rebels against the truth—sometimes by idolatry, sometimes by Jewish conceit, sometimes from unbelief, sometimes from the vanity of human prejudice—came to teach men humility, so that no human being will think himself important, but will ascribe everything to the Father of all. (3) And so, although he is life—as he says, "I am the

[85] Cf. Anc. Proem; 2,1; 5,1.
[86] Cf. Isa 5:20 and Ath. Or. I 1.
[87] Cf. 1 Cor 2:12–13.
[88] Cf. John 17:2–3.

life"[89]—and although he has the power to give life, he has no wish to confuse what is right. < As > he has come for one sovereignty, one Godhead, one truth, one concord, one Glory, to secure men's salvation and understanding, he also asks of the Father before his disciples. (4) For which son does not ask his father? And which father does not give to his son? But what kind of son is different from the nature of his father? And thus < the > Son, "the only-begotten of a Father, full of grace and truth,"[90] needed no filling, < since he was > not in want of truth but full of grace and truth. (5) And he who is full both gives and can give; but his will is to refer all things to the Father.

For the Son glorifies the Father and the Father glorifies the Only-begotten. "I have glorified thee on the earth,"[91] said the Son to the Father, and the Father said to the Son, "I have both glorified thee, and will glorify thee again."[92] (6) The Godhead can have no dispute, no envy: "Grant them to have life in themselves."[93] He who is life, wills to receive life from the Father and give it to his disciples although he himself is life, so as not to divide the Divine Unity and thus not put an obstacle in the way of the Jews—so that the Jews would hear him asking of the Father.

30,1 How does the Son ask the Father, then? As though not having and so asking? No, but by declaring the oneness of the Trinity, which provides the gifts perfectly to one who receives them worthily. But to show the Godhead's oneness, in another passage he gives [gifts], no longer by asking for them but by giving his own on his own authority, for he is Wellspring of Wellspring,[94] and God of God; < for > "He breathed in their faces and said, 'Receive ye the Holy Spirit.' "[95] (2) And in another passage "He lifted up his hands and said," "Receive ye the Holy Spirit."[96]

And he has life in himself, to give to whomever he will. "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath the Son life in himself."[97] (3) And you see that [it is] from honor of the Father and for the sake of one unity and one glory, and so that the disciples will not suppose that the Only-begotten has come to divert the believers' minds from the God of the Law and the

---

89 John 14:6.
90 John 1:14.
91 John 17:4.
92 Cf. John 12:18.
93 Cf. John 5:26; 17:2–3.
94 Perhaps cf. Ath. Or. I 19.
95 John 20:22.
96 Cf. Luke 24:50.
97 Cf. John 5:26.

prophets—(4)[it is] for this reason that, being God and foreknowing of the malice of men, he addresses these words as to the Father and gives the Father the glory that cannot be taken away. And so Mani will be confounded, who denies the Father; the disciples will learn that the Godhead is the same in the Old and the New Testaments; the Jews will be put to shame because the Only-begotten did not come to teach another God but to reveal his Godhead and that of his heavenly Father. (5) "Grant them to have life in themselves," [he says], although he himself was proclaiming this life. Why, then, would he ask the Father to give them what he himself was teaching and giving? For he made the life known later on by saying, "This is life, that they may know thee, the only true God."[98]

31,1 Next, because Christ said, "the *only* true God,"[99] Arius and his followers jump at the verse as though they have found an argument against the truth. "He said, 'The only true God.' You see, then, that only the Father is true."

31,2 But let's ask you Arians ourselves, "What do you mean? Is only the Father true? But what is the Son? Isn't the Son true? If the Son isn't 'true,' 'Our faith is vain and our preaching is in vain.'[100] (3) And in blasphemy against your own selves you will be found to be likening the Son of < God > to the unspeakable, infamous idols—you to whom the prophets said, as though to persons who are suffering a delusion, < 'Solomon says, The worship of the unspeakable idols is the beginning of all evil.'* >[101] And each of the prophets recalled this text, < like Jeremiah* > who said, < 'Woe unto them that follow after idols,'* >[102] and, 'Our fathers made for themselves false gods, and their high places became false.'[103] (4) The Only-begotten too is condemned in your eyes, and you thus hold a disgusting opinion of 'him who redeemed you'[104]—if, indeed, he did redeem you. For since you deny your Savior who redeemed you, you cannot be of his fold."

For if God is not true, he should not be worshiped; and if he is created, he is not God. And if he is not to be worshiped, how can he be called God? Stop it, you who < are making a god* > of one more natural object, (5) who are conducting Babylonian < worship* >, who have set up Nebuchadnez-

98 Cf. John 17:3 and Ath. Or. Ill 26.
99 Cf. Ath. Or. I 6.
100 1 Cor. 15:14.
101 Holl suggests that some scriptural citations, including Wisd. Sol. 14:27, have fallen out here.
102 Cf. Jer. 9:14.
103 Cf. Jer. 16:19 and 3:32.
104 Gal 3:13.

zar's image and idol! You who are blowing this renowned trumpet to unite < the worshipers >[105] < against > the Son of God* >; who, with your wrong words, are bringing the peoples to disaster with music, cymbals and psaltery, preparing them to serve an image rather than God and truth. And who else is as true as the Son of God? (6) "For who shall be likened to the Lord among the sons of God?"[106] says the scripture, and, "None other shall be reckoned in comparison with him."[107] And what does he say [next]? To show you that he means the Son, he describes him next and says, "He hath found out every way of understanding, and given it < to Jacob his servant and Israel whom he loveth. > (7) And thereafter he appeared on earth and consorted with men."[108] How can this not have been said truly of him? < And how can the Son not be true God* > when he says, "I am the truth?"[109]

32,1 But you will ask me, "Why did the only-begotten true God say, 'that they may know thee, the *only* true God?" [I reply],"to discourage polytheism, to prevent division of the life-giving knowledge?[110] If the Father is the only true God, then the Son is true and truly begotten of the Father! (2) For it was 'to honor the Father'[111] and reveal him alone as 'true God,' that the Son made it known that he is 'truly begotten of the Father.' "

And how was this to be made known? (3) Just look at the texts here! It says here that the Father is the only "true God," but in the Gospel according to John it says, "He was the true light.[112] And which "true light" was this but the Only-begotten? And again, the scriptures say of God, "God is light,"[113] and they didn't say, "God is true light." On the other hand, they said of God's only-begotten Son that the Only-begotten is "true light."

32,4 It said, "true God," of the Father, and not that God is "true light." But of the Son, it said, "God," and didn't add "true" to "The Son is God." And where it said, "God is light," it didn't add, "true light." Then what should we say of the Father? We < shall confess* > that God is "true light," and not make the Godhead defective. (5) And because "true light" is not [said of God] in the scripture, should we < also > sinfully say that God

---

105 Holl: προσκυνούντων; MSS: πολεμούντων.
106 Ps 88:7.
107 Bar 3:36.
108 Bar 3:37–38.
109 John 14:6.
110 Cf. Ath. Or. C. Ar. I 6.
111 Cf. John 8:49.
112 John 1:9.
113 1 John 1:5.

is not true light? And since scripture says that the Son is God, and that he was God with the true Father—('The Word was God';[114] and it didn't say that the Word *became* God, but that he *was* God)—the equivalence [of the Father and the Son] will be shown by the two phrases. From the Father's being "true God" and the Son's being "true light" the equality of their rank will be evident; and from the Son's being "God" and the Father's being "light" the equivalence of their glory will be made plain. (6) And there will be no difference, nor can anyone contradict the truth, but the Father is true God, and the Only-begotten is true God.

33,1 But I am obliged to speak further here, about the Holy Spirit, or, if I leave anything out, I may give the enemy, who want < to contradict >, a chance to hold their < wicked beliefs* >. For it is the same with the Holy Spirit, as the Lord himself testifies by saying "the Spirit of truth" and "the Spirit of the Father,"[115] but the apostle by saying "Spirit of Christ." (2) Thus, being the Spirit of the Father [and] the Spirit of the Son, the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of truth, the Spirit of God, just as God is true God, just as he is true light. For there is one Trinity, one glory, one Godhead, one Lordship. (3) The Father is a father, the Son is a son, the Holy Spirit is a holy spirit. The Trinity is not an identity, not separate from its own unity, not wanting in perfection, not strange to its own identity, but is one Perfection, three Perfects, one Godhead.

33,4 And the sword of the opposition has fallen [from its hand]. Indeed, scripture says, "< Their blows became a weapon > of babes."[116] Even if infants want to take weapons they lack the strength, and cannot do anything with their hands. Even though infants are roused to anger they kill and do harm to themselves rather [than anyone else], since they cannot make an armed attack on others. Similarly these people have sent their imposture to war with themselves, but will bring no evil on the sons of the truth.

34,1 But once more I shall go on to other texts which they have thought of. To begin with, the falsehood they use in order to deceive the simple and innocent is amazing. As the serpent deceived Eve in her innocence, so they, if they wish to win their allegiance, first < approach* > those who do not wish to go by their creed with much flattery, and with liberal expenditure, attention, and both promises and threats, such as "You're opposing

[114] John 1:1.
[115] For both, see John 15:26.
[116] Ps 63:8.

the imperial decrees and the wrath of the emperor Valens." (2) And what do they say [next]? "Well, what is it that we're saying? It's the faith [itself], only you're [too] proud [to admit it]!"

All right, let's see whether this is the faith. They say, "We confess that the Son is begotten of the Father, and do not deny it. (3) But," they say, "we must also confess that he is a creature and a product of creation."

But nothing could be more pathetic. Nothing created is like anything begotten, and nothing begotten is like anything created, especially in the case of that one, pure and perfect essence. (4)[117] For all things have been created by God, but only God's Son has been begotten, and only the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father and received of the Son. All other things are created beings, and neither proceeded from the Father nor received of the Son, but received *of the Son's fullness*, as the scripture says, "By the Word of God were all things established, and all the host of them by the Spirit of his mouth."[118]

34,5 "But we must confess the creaturehood as well," says Arius, "since scripture said 'creature' in a figurative sense, and 'offspring' is meant figuratively. For even if we say, 'offspring,' we shall not mean an offspring like any other."

Well then, they are deceiving the innocent by saying, "offspring," and the offspring isn't real. (6) "But we also confess Christ's creaturehood," they say. "For Christ is also called door, way, pillar, cloud, rock, lamb,[119] lamb,[120] stream, calf, lion, well-spring, wisdom, Word, Son, angel, Christ, Savior, Lord, man, Son of Man, cornerstone, sun, prophet, bread, king, building, husbandman, shepherd, vine, and all sorts of things like these. In the same way," they say, "we also use 'creature' in an accommodated sense of the word. For we are bound to confess it."

35,1 Such wicked speculation, and such cunning! May the Lord allow no son of the truth to be brought by such dissimulation to accept "creature" as the Son of God's title for such reasons, and make that confession. Let them tell us what the use of this is, and we will grant them the conclusion of their reasonings. (2) For all those things are ways of speaking and do not impair the Son's divinity, make him defective in comparison with the Father, or < alter him* > from his essential nature. Even if he should be called "door," it is because we enter by him; if road, it is because we go

---

117 We insert a paragraph number missing in Holl.
118 Cf. Ps 32:6.
119 ἀρνίον.
120 ἀμνός.

by him; if "pillar," because he is the support of the truth. Even if "cloud," this is because he overshadowed the children of Israel, if "fire," because of the brightness of the fire which gave them light in the wilderness. Even if he should be called "manna," this is because they denied that he was the bread from heaven; if "bread," because we are strengthened by him.

35,3 Even if "angel," this is because he is an angel of a great counsel. The word, "angel," is a synonym. Rahab received the "angels," and yet the men who had been sent there were not angels, but *the persons who brought the report*[121] of the place. And so, because he reported the Father's will to men, the Only-begotten is an "angel of a great counsel," who reports the great counsel in the world.

35,4 Even if he should be called "stone," the "stone" is not inanimate; this is a way of speaking, because he has become a stumbling block to the Jews, but a foundation of salvation to us. And he is called "cornerstone" because he unites the Old and the New Testaments, circumcision and uncircumcision, as one body. (5) But he is called "lamb" because of his harmlessness, and because the sin of humankind has been done away by his offering to the Father as a lamb for the slaughter; for the Impassible came to suffer for our salvation. And whatever else in these usages is an aid to human salvation is applied to him by the sacred scripture in some accommodated sense.

36,1 Now what good can "creature" do, or what use is it to our salvation and to the glory and perfect divinity of the incarnate divine Word? How does calling him "creature" help us? What can a creature do for creatures? How does a creature benefit creatures? (2) Why did God create < a Son > and allow < him > to be worshiped as God, when he says, "Thou shalt not make to thyself any likeness, neither on earth nor in heaven, and thou shalt not worship it?"[122] Why did he create a Son for himself and order that he be worshiped, particularly when the apostle says, "And they served the creature rather than the creator, and were made fools."[123] It is foolish to treat a creature as God and break the first commandment, which says, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve."[124] (3) And thus God's holy church worships, not a creature but a begotten Son, the Father in the Son, and the Son in the Father, with the Holy Spirit.

---

121 οἱ ἀναγγείλαντες.
122 Exod 20:47.
123 Rom 1:25; 22.
124 Deut 6:13; Matt 4:10.

36,4 "Oh, yes!" says Arius. "Unless I say he is a creature, I attribute diminution to the Father. For the creature does not diminish the creator, but by the nature of things the begotten shrinks its begetter, or broadens or lessens or cuts it, or does it some such injury."[125]

36,5 It is most foolish of those who think such things to imagine Godhead in their likeness—and of those who attribute their frailties to God, since God is wholly impassible, both in begetting and in creating. We are creatures, and as we suffer when we beget, we tire when we create. And if the Father suffers in begetting, then he also tires in creating.

36,6 But how can one speak of suffering in connection with God, and of his tiring if he creates? He does not tire, never think it! The scripture says, "He shall not weary."[126] "God is spirit"[127] and begot the Son spiritual<ly>, without beginning and not in time, "God of God, light of light, very God of very God, begotten, not made."[128]

37,1 But I shall pass this text by too, and once more devote my attention to others which they repeat and bandy about in wrong senses, and which I have mentioned earlier. For again, they confusedly misinterpret this one: "Receive your high priest, who is faithful to him that *made* him."[129] (2) In the first place they reject this Epistle, I mean the Epistle to the Hebrews, remove it bodily from the Apostle and say that it is not his. But because of their malady they < turn > the text to their advantage, as I said, take it in a wrong sense, and covertly introduce the Son's creaturehood, supposedly by means of the words, "faithful to him that *made* him."[130]

37,3 But someone with sense might ask them when our Lord adopted the title of "high priest," and they will be at a loss because they have no answer. (4) Christ never adopted these names before his incarnation—stone, sheep led to the slaughter, man and Son of Man, eagle, lamb and all the rest that are applied to him after his coming in the flesh. Thus he is called "high priest" because of the declaration the Law made of him, "A prophet shall the Lord raise unto you, of your brethren."[131] (5) The text thus plainly explains "prophet," "high priest," and "of them" [as titles given] *after* his sojourn on earth, and it can be seen at a glance how, once again,

---

125 Cf. Ath. Or. C. Ar. I 15; 21.
126 Isa 40:28. Cf. Ath. Nic. 7.
127 John 4:24.
128 Creed of Nicaea, as given, for example, at Ath. Jov. 3.
129 Heb 3:1–2. Cf. Ath. Sent. Dion. 10–11.
130 Heb 3:2.
131 Deut 18:15.

God's unconquerable power and foreknowledge foretold and certified all this by its wondrous light, to the "stopping of every mouth"[132] that rebels against the truth. (6) For he says in the same passage, "Every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men to offer gifts and sacrifices, being able to bear with [their infirmities]. For he hath need < to offer > for his own sins. But he that had no sin offered himself to the Father."[133] (7) And "of men" is said because of the earthly sojourn, but "not of men" < and > "that hath no sin" are said because of the divinity. And of his divinity he says, "though he were a son"; but of his humanity, "He learned by the things he suffered."[134]

38,1 And you see that all of Christ's titles are simple and have nothing complicated in them. "High priest faithful to him that *made him*" here describes neither the making of his body here nor of his human nature, nor is it speaking of creation at all, but of the bestowal of his rank after his incarnation, like the text, "He gave him a name which is above every name."[135] (2) And this was not done of old in the divine nature, but < in > his current advent, since the human nature he took from Mary received the name above every name, the title "Son of God" in addition to the title of "Divine Word." (3) And again, for this reason he has said here, through the apostle himself, "We see Jesus, who for a little was made lower than the angels crowned with glory and honor,"[136] so that the Master and Maker of the angels would appear lower than they; so that he who inspires the angels with dread and fear and, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, made the angels from nothing, would be called "lower," and it would be plainly evident that he is not speaking of his Godhead here, but of his flesh.

38,4 For the suffering of death was not counted as the Word's before he took flesh, but after his incarnation, with the same Word being passible and impassible—impassible in Godhead but suffering in his manhood, just as both titles apply to the one [person]—"Son of Man" to the same person, and "Son of God" to the same. For Christ is called the "Son" in both alike.

39,1 What did God "make" him, then? From all that has been said the trouble-makers should learn that nothing in this text is relevant to the

---

132 Rom 3:19 (2 Cor 10:5).
133 Heb 5:1; 3; 8:3; 9:14.
134 Heb 2:9.
135 Phil 2:9.
136 Heb 2:9.

Godhead but to the human nature. And "made him," does not refer to the making or creating of him, but to his rank after the advent.

39,2 If someone asks a king about his son, and says, "What is he to you?" the king will tell him, "He is my son."

"Is he your legitimate or your illegitimate son?" The king will say, "He is my legitimate son."

"Then what did you make him?"

"I made him king." Plainly, the son's rank is no different from his father's. (3) And because he has said, "I made him king," this surely does not mean that the king is saying, "I created him." In saying, "I made him," he has certainly not denied the begetting of him—which he had acknowledged—but has made that plain; "I made him," however, was a statement of his rank. Thus, by those who wish < to obtain > salvation, the Son is unambiguously believed to be the Son of the Father, and is worshiped.

39,4 But "was made high priest" is said because he offered himself in his body to the Father for mankind, himself the priest, himself the victim; as high priest for all creation he offered himself spiritually and gloriously in his body itself and "sat down at the Father's right hand,"[137] after "being made an high priest forever"[138] and "passing through the heavens"[139] once and for all. The same holy apostle testifies to this of him in the lines that follow. (5) And once again their ostensible discussion of sacred scripture, which they use as their excuse, has proved a failure, for scripture is life-giving; nothing in it offers an obstacle to the faithful or makes for the downfall of blasphemy against the Word.

40,1 Then they have mentioned another passage, when John was standing in the wilderness, saw him coming and said, "This is he of whom I said unto you, a man cometh after me that *was made*[140] before me, for he was before me."[141] (2) And first, as though they were half drowsy, they misunderstand the expressions themselves and say, "How could this apply to the human nature, when he was not conceived in Mary's womb before the conception of John? Instead, as the evangelist says 'In the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent to a city of Galilee, to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph. And he came in unto her and said, Hail,

137 Heb 10:12.
138 Heb 7:3.
139 Heb 9:14.
140 γέγονεν.
141 Cf. John 1:29–30.

thou that art highly favored, the Lord is with thee,'[142] and the rest that follows. (3) When the virgin was troubled at his greeting he said to her, 'Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb and bear a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. And behold, thy cousin Elizabeth hath conceived a son in her old age, and this is the sixth month with her that is called barren.'[143] And you see," they say, "that John was already there six months before the annunciation to Mary. (4) How can 'He was made[144] before me' apply to Christ's human nature?"

Can any innocent soul whose mind is not clear and firmly made up, hear that without being upset? (5) For <truly>,[145] for those who bring their troubles on themselves, the sacred scriptures' cogent, innocent, life-giving teachings appear to do more harm then [good] although the texts are always illumined in the Holy Spirit. (6) What has been omitted to make the text convincing? See here, it says "This"—to indicate something visible and show it to the onlookers—"This is he of whom I said unto you that he cometh after me." And who is coming but a "man?" But no one with sense would suppose that our Lord is a *mere* man—only the sects we have already indicated, the Cerinthians, Merinthians and Ebionites.

40,7 But together with knowing him as "man" it is surely true that the true believers know him with certainty as Lord as John testifies, "That which we have heard from the beginning,"[146] meaning him who is from the beginning—the invisible divine Word, of whom we have heard in the sacred scriptures, who is proclaimed in the prophets, who is hymned in heaven. (8) Thus the intent of < the line >, "We have heard with our ears from the beginning and have seen with our eyes," is for the word, "hear," coming first, to confess that he is God from the beginning, but for the word "see" to show that he is the man of whom John the Baptist said, "After me cometh a man."[147] And "our hands have handled" is meant to show that he is God from on high and indicate that he is visible man, born of Mary and raised whole from the dead without losing the sacred vessel and perfect human nature he had taken; it is meant instead, from the handling of his side and the nail-prints, to give unshakeable testimony to all three. (9) So please understand here too that "This is he of whom

142 Luke 1:26–28.
143 Luke 1:30–31; 36.
144 ἐγένετο.
145 Holl: ἀληθῶς; MSS: λέγει.
146 1 John 1:1.
147 John 1:30.

I said unto you that a man cometh after me"[148] is meant to show the human nature, and "He was before me" to show the Godhead "because he was before me." For "He was in the world," says the holy Gospel, "and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not."[149]

41,1 But if he was in the world before the creation and begetting of John he had arrived in the world before him—not meaning creation or making, but in the sense in which people use the same word to say, "I arrived[150] in Jerusalem, arrived in Babylon, arrived in Ethiopia, arrived in Alexandria"—not meaning creation here, but presence and arrival. (2) What does "I arrived in Babylon" or some other place mean but, "I came [there]?" "He arrived [here] before me" shows the continual presence on earth of the Word, and "He was before me" shows that the Godhead is eternal. "Coming after me" does, however, indicate his conception after John's.

And so "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness"[151] means a cry to draw people's attention. (3) When people call they give a loud shout first without any words, to call from a distance to the people who need to hear something from them. And once the people hear the shout [which is] only [a shout], and pay attention and get ready to hear, then finally the shouter pronounces whatever words he wanted to say. (4) And thus John was a voice in the wilderness to draw people's attention. For John himself was not the Word; the Word on whose account the preparatory shout was heard came after him. And this is why he says, "the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord."[152] (5) The voice prepares the ways, but the Lord sets foot on the ways which have been prepared. And a voice speaks < to > the ear; but when the ear is receptive, the word is implanted in the ears of its receivers. Thus Arius and his followers will never perceive God's truth although it enlightens the hearts of the faithful at all times to prevent their turning away from the salvation which is to be found in the Word, the true, uncreated and unoriginate Son of God.

42,1 But again, as I go ahead and come to each topic in turn, I shall not omit any point I have previously proposed for solution but take up the thread again.[153] Once more the Arians offer another excuse, St. Peter's words in Acts, "Be it known unto you, all ye house of Israel, that God hath

148 John 1:30.
149 John 1:23.
150 ἐγενόμην.
151 John 1:23.
152 John 1:23.
153 I.e., the Arian arguments in the order of their appearance at 14,1–15,4.

made this Jesus whom ye crucified both Lord and Christ."[154] (2) And again they say, "Here we find 'made' in scripture"; and they do not see that the phrase, "this Jesus"—for the phrase is self-explanatory—means the Lord's human nature. < The meaning* > is clear from "this Jesus *whom ye crucified.*" This is < plainly* > the flesh which they crucified, for < it is clear that > they crucified flesh. (3) And thus the Lord says in the Gospel, "But now ye seek to kill me, a *man* that hath told you the truth which I have heard of my Father,"[155] < declaring himself man* > but not separating his Godhead from his manhood. (4) For neither was Christ's Godhead separate from his manhood when he was about to suffer, nor when he suffered was the human nature abandoned by the Word. But no more had the impassible Word previously suffered; he suffered < only > in the suffering flesh. For the same name truly applies to both natures and is given to the divine nature and to the human. The human nature of the Word himself is Christ, and yet Christ is the Lord in the human nature itself. (5) But the suffering is in the flesh, as Peter said, "Christ suffered for us *in flesh*"—to show the divine nature's impassibility—and again, "dying *in the flesh,* brought to life in the Spirit."[156]

Thus Peter said "this *Jesus* whom ye crucified" to show that the sacred human nature was not abandoned by the impassible and uncreated Word, but was united with the uncreated Word on high. (6) And this is why he said, "God hath *made* Lord and Christ"[157] the thing that was conceived by Mary, the thing that had been united with Godhead. For Mary is not divine by nature, and for this reason he adds "made." And so, when Mary asked him, "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?" the angel Gabriel said, "The Spirit of the Lord shall come upon thee and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee. Therefore also that which shall be born shall be called holy, the Son of God."[158]

42,7 But when he said, "that which shall be *born*," he showed unquestionably that the divine Word is indubitably a *Son*, not created, not made. (8) And as to the human nature which was born of Mary, he showed, by adding "that which is born < shall > also < be called holy, the Son of God >," that God had made < even the thing that was born > Christ and Lord. And as everything about the other passages has been fully dealt with

---

154 Acts 2:36. Cf. Ath. C. Apol. 2.9.
155 John 8:40.
156 1 Pet 3:18.
157 Acts 2:36.
158 Luke 1:34–35.

and presents no difficulty, here too everything about his human nature had been dealt with, and for those who are attending to their salvation there is no bypath. (9) For the Word is a living Word from a living Father—the Father's Son, not his creature. But everything in the human nature has been dealt with, so that no one may suppose that he is an apparition, or that his flesh is co-essential with his Godhead on high, but everyone [will realize] that the human nature is united in one impassibility, especially after his resurrection from the dead. For scripture says, "He dieth no more, death hath no more dominion over him."[159] (10) There is one Lord, one Christ, one King, seated at the Father's right hand; that which is physical and spiritual is one union, one spiritual Godhead, both natures radiant and glorious. (11) But since I feel that the passage has been sufficiently expounded I shall pass it by; and let me take up the discussion by < going on* > to < warn > my hearers against the other parts of their < foolishness > which they have invented for the overthrow of their hearers.[160]

43,1 For again, they say, "If he is of the Father's essence why does he not know the hour and the day, but by his own admission acknowledges to the disciples that he does not know the things the Father knows and says, 'Of that day and of that hour knoweth no man, not even the angels in heaven or the Son, but the Father only.'[161] (2) If the Father knows," they say, "and he doesn't know, how can the Father's and the Son's Godhead be the same, when the Son doesn't know what the Father does?"

43,3 But not knowing their human frailty, they seize, to their own harm, on everything that the Only-begotten, in his divine wisdom, teaches mystically for the assurance of the truest knowledge—as horrid serpents, when caught by a crafty hunter, take the bait to their own destruction. They do not know that falsehood will never stand, while the truth always keeps its own sons straight and confounds falsehood. (4) Those who harbor this evil suspicion of Christ from the first must tell us which is by nature greater and more important to know—God the Lord of all and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, or the day which is brought to its dawning by the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and the hour when it dawns. But if they are asked that question, the truth itself will surely oblige them to say that the Father is greater, as indeed he is.

---

[159] Rom 6:9.

[160] Holl: παρατροπήν, which construes which the word Holl restores, μωρολογίας; MSS: ἀνατροπήν.

[161] Matt 24:36; cf. Ath. Or. Ill C. Ar. 26.

43,5 Now if the Son says, "Neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and no man knoweth the Son save the Father,"[162] when he knows the greater thing, the Father, how can he not know the lesser thing? But these words are divine and spoken by the Holy Spirit, and are unknowable by those who have not received the gift and grace of the Holy Spirit. (6) For such are the Arians with their wavering spirit and feeble intellect, and they slip into hurtful deviations even in their minor ones.

44,1 For the Lord's own words will step out to meet them, "Be ye ready, < let > your loins < be > girded about and let there be lamps in your hands, and be ye as good servants, awaiting their Master. For like a thief in the night, so will the day come."[163] And the holy apostle says, "Ye are not children of the night but of the day, lest the day should come upon you as a thief."[164] (2) If, then, the children of the day are not hidden by the darkness, but are ready because "Their Master cometh in a day they know not and at an hour they await not,"[165] then, because of his brilliant being and his Godhead, will not < He who > gives them being be different from his servants, the sons of the day? Or, like those who do not know the day and are unprepared, will he be caught in ignorance and subject to deficiency? (3) Who but the < in >sane could suppose these things of the Lord, that he will be like his subjects and disciples—or like those who, from their unpreparedness and ignorance, are inferior to these? That is just silly.

44,4 Now if these things are not possible, but the explanation, when compared with it, turns out to contradict the saying, we need to see what explanation we can find that will leave both saying and explanation uncontradicted and prevent our deviating from the truth. For the Lord cannot lie, and can give no expositions for our salvation in vain.

44,5 Thus the Father knows [the day], the Son knows, and the Holy Spirit knows. For nothing in the Father is different from the Son, nor is anything in the Son different from the Spirit. In every Sect, when I needed to, I have shown with authentic proofs that the Trinity is one Godhead and has no internal differences but is all perfection—three Perfects, one glory and one sovereignty.

45,1 But you will ask me, "Why did he say this, then?" And I have already given an explanation of this elsewhere.[166] But nothing need keep

---

162 Matt 11:27.
163 Cf. Matt 24:44; Luke 12:35; 1 Thes 5:2.
164 1 Thes 5:4.
165 Matt 24:44; 50.
166 Cf. Anc. 89,2.

me from adding to the same things and telling the same truths; "To me it is not burdensome, but it will be a safeguard"[167] for the readers and refutatory for the opposition. The reason for this is as follows. (2) Christ has made incidental mention, in the same sentence, of three ranks: the Father, himself, and the angels in heaven. And he has attributed knowing to the Father, implying not only acquaintance and knowledge but everything that is always indubitably controlled, brought about and made by the Father and the Son. (3) Indeed the Father knows the day—knows it, has fashioned and made it, and < at the same time > judged, as he said in the Gospel according to John, "The Father judgeth no man, but hath given all judgment to the Son[168]—in *giving* judgment he has judged; in judging, then, he knew [the day]; knowing, he is aware of when it will come. (4) For "He that believeth not on the Son is judged already"[169]—not in the sense that the judgment is past, but that what will happen then is already made plain, just as any particular thing follows from this [or that cause]. For scripture is aware of more than one sort of "knowledge"; and in my frequent returns to the main point I have never ceased to clarify and explain each subject with the similes and examples which have already been discussed.

46,1 So let's take < up > the discussion again < too >, from the beginning, and speak about these things. What do you mean, people? Did or didn't Adam know Eve his wife even before their disobedience and transgression? And you can't contradict the truth. (2) Even though you prefer not to deal fairly with the sense of this, you will be exposed, for scripture says, "They were naked and were not ashamed."[170] For if they were naked and not blind[171] they saw and knew each other. For neither can you deny this and not admit that they could see; "Eve *saw* that the tree was good for food and goodly to look upon."[172] Thus they saw and knew.

And by knowing and seeing they recognized each other. (3) But it was much later when scripture said, "And Adam *knew* Eve his wife" It speaks of the first knowledge and sight in the sense of knowledge gained by seeing and intellection, but in the case of the second acquaintance and knowledge it is describing knowledge by experience. (4) Thus the sacred

---

167 Cf. Phil 3:1.
168 John 5:22.
169 John 3:18.
170 Gen. 2:25; cf. Clem. Hom. 111.42.
171 Holl: < ἑαυτούς εἶδον καὶ ἠδεισαν >.
172 Gen 3:6.

scripture says the same of David in his old age, "And David was old and could not keep warm. And his servants said, Let a virgin be sought for the king. And there was found Abishag the Shunamite."[173] And it says, "And she warmed him, and he slept by her side, and David knew her not."[174] (5) How could he not know her when she was close to his body and slept beside him? But here scripture is describing, not knowledge by intellection but knowledge by experience.

46,6 Indeed it is the same with Jacob. When he was herding with Leah and Rachel for seven years he knew them. But when the scripture speaks of their lawful conjugal intercourse it says, "He *knew* Leah his wife."[175] The first knowing was by intellection and sight, but the second acquaintance and knowing was by experience and activity.

46,7 And likewise in the sacred scripture "The Lord knoweth them that are his"[176] doesn't mean that he doesn't know those who aren't his, but refers to the activity of the Lord's assistance. And [so with] "Depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity. I never knew you."[177] Did he have no intellectual knowledge of them? But because they were not worthy of him he withholds his personal knowledge from them. And elsewhere he says, (8) "You have I known of all nations."[178] [If we take this literally], all the nations, and the entire human population, have been left out of his knowledge. On the contrary, aren't the hairs of each one's head known < by > him—of those who serve, and those who disobey him? And "God knoweth the ways on the right hand."[179] Doesn't he know the ways on the left? And how much of this sort can be said of the different kinds of knowledge!

47,1 And so with God's only-begotten Son. Since < he says >, "The Father hath given judgment to the Son,"[180] he attributed the knowledge of personal acquaintance and experience to the Father. For "No one knoweth the day save the Father"[181] is meant in two ways. He knows when it comes—indeed, the day and hour come by his authority—and he knows it < by

[173] 3 Kms 1:2–3.
[174] 3 Kms 1:4.
[175] Cf. Gen 29:23.
[176] 2 Tim 2:19.
[177] Luke 13:27.
[178] Deut 14:2.
[179] Prov 4:27a.
[180] John 5:22.
[181] Matt 24:36.

acting >. For there has already been activity on his part, the delegation of the judgment to the Only-begotten.

47,2 And thus the same knowledge is in the only-begotten Son of God, since he is God and no different from the Father. For he himself knows the day, he brings it himself, carries it on, brings it to an end, and judges, and without him it cannot come. (3) But he does not know it through activity yet, that is, he has not yet judged. The impious are still impious, the unrighteous covet, fornicators, adulterers and idolaters commit iniquity, the devil is at work, sects arise, and imposture does its work until God's only-begotten Son brings the day itself, and gives each his just due. And < then* > he will know it < through activity* >, that is, [know] it through deed and power. (4) And in the Father knowledge is complete in two ways, but in the Son it is there by intellection and is not unknown, but has not yet been completed by activity, that is, he has not yet judged.

47,5 But knowledge has been withheld from the holy angels in two ways—< in that they do not yet know [the day] > intellectually, and < also > that they do not yet know it through activity, that is, through the fulfillment of their function. For they have not yet been directed to go out, gather the impious in bundles like tares and prepare them for burning. (6) And you see, beloved and servants of God, that all these people who welcome shocking notions because of some preconception of their own, have gone to war in vain, and directed against themselves their various attempts to blaspheme the Son of God as lesser and inferior.

48,1 But now that we have also explained this sufficiently let us once again, by the power of God, devote our attention to their other arguments. Although these great heretics who are game for anything do not have beliefs like the Manichaeans or like many other sects, still, even though they hold that Christ's fleshliness is real, they hold even this inadequately and not in the fullest sense. (2) They confess that the Savior truly had flesh; but when they learn from the Gospel itself that he tired from his journey, was hungry and thirsty, and went to sleep and got up, they put all this together and apply it to his Godhead as though they wanted to separate his Godhead from the Father's essence for reasons like the following.[182] (3) For they say, "If he is of the Father, but the Father does not tire or thirst or hunger as the sacred scripture says, "He shall not weary not hunger nor thirst nor sleep, and of his counsel there is no finding

[182] Cf. Ath. Sent. Dion. 27.1–2.

out"[183]—(4) if these things are characteristic of the Son, they say, "then he is different from the Father's essence and nature." And they themselves will admit that before the incarnation these things did not apply to the Only-begotten. However, when they are forced to admit this and come to the things he did in his human nature, and hear that naturally he did these things because he had taken a body, yielding to them for his legitimate needs like a mule yielding to a chariot because he had taken flesh in reality and not appearance, then they claim that this was not due to his flesh alone.

49,1 For in fact [flesh] cannot of itself thirst or grow tired. But those who have left the road and turned off on paths that lead in the opposite direction do not know that the Son of God did not simply take flesh at his coming, but also took a soul, a mind and everything human except for sin, and was < truly begotten >, though not of a man's seed, but of the holy virgin Mary by the Holy Spirit. (2) < But if* > they will not admit < themselves* > that he has taken a soul, < they will be made fools of* > by this arguent against them, which is the simplest of all the replies to their nonsense.[184] (3) The true God—< who > says of himself, "I am the truth"—himself acknowledges that "My soul is troubled,"[185] "My soul is exceeding sorrowful,"[186] and "I have power to lay down my soul and to take it"[187]—[this last] to show that, as God, he has this power, < but that by his incarnation he has truly become man* >. (4) For no [mere] man could say this; no one has the power to lay his soul down and take it. But when Christ speaks of a soul he shows that he has become man in reality, not appearance.

49,5 And again, [he says], "I am the good shepherd who layeth down his soul for the sheep."[188] And to show the reality of these things he said to his Father on the cross, "Into thy hands I commend my spirit";[189] and when the soldiers came, the scripture says, "They found that he had already given up the ghost."[190] (6) And again, "Crying with a loud voice" he said, "Eli, Eli, lema sabachthani, that is, My God, my God, why hast thou

183 Isa 40:28.
184 John 14:6.
185 John 12:27.
186 Matt 26:38.
187 John 10:18.
188 John 10:11.
189 Luke 23:46.
190 Cf. John 19:33.

forsaken me?"[191]—I have also explained this way of speaking earlier—and, as the Gospel says, "gave up the ghost." (7) For when the truth says, "He gave up the ghost," "into thy hands," "My soul is troubled," and all the rest, who would be < so > foolish as to believe such a bunch of half blind dreamers and ignore the actual credible statements of the divine Word?

50,1 And then, like pirates mutilating sound bodies, hunting out of each scripture things which have been said well and rightly, they appeal to some expression which the scripture often uses figuratively. And they like to cite in a literal sense something that has been said figuratively, but interpret a literal and unequivocal statement as an allegory of something else. (2) They jump right up and cite some words from the holy Isaiah which were spoken in the person of the Father, "Behold, my servant shall understand, my beloved in whom I am well pleased, whom my soul loveth,"[192] as though this is the Father speaking; for so indeed he is. (3) "Well, now," they say, "has the Father taken a soul too?" But if we say, "Of course not! What can this be but a figurative expression?" they reply, "Then what was said by the Son is figurative too." (4) And they think they can get an occasion against the truth in this way, but it won't be given them. The truth stands unadorned on its own feet, undefeated and with no need for decoration.

50,5 For let's see what both of these mean. If the Father became corporeal, assumed flesh and said these words, he really took a soul. But if the Father did not assume flesh and still said, "my soul," this is a figure of speech referring to God, to safeguard the [Son's] legitimacy and show the legitimacy of the Father's relationship to the Son. (6) But one cannot say the same of the Son in this respect. The Father did not take flesh, while the Son assumed flesh. The Father did not become man, but the Son did.

50,7 Something similar may be said of the Father. As he says, "My soul hath loved him,"[193] in this passage, so he says, "I have found David the son of Jesse, a man after mine heart,"[194] "My heart is far from them."[195] (8) If we take what is said of the soul figuratively because "My soul hath loved" is a figure of speech, then what is said of the heart is also figurative. And clearly, this must be evident to any sensible person. (9) Therefore, if the Father speaks figuratively of a soul and a heart, which he did not take—

191 Matt 27:46.
192 Isa 42:1.
193 Isa 42:1.
194 Cf. 1 Kms 13:14.
195 Isa 29:13.

for he did not assume flesh—things of this sort are applied to the Father in a figurative sense. But the same is not to be supposed of the Son; for the Son took flesh, and the entire human constitution.

51,1 This will serve as a reply to anyone who speaks figuratively of the Son with regard to < the > humanity, since there is no < allegorical > expression even* > in a part of a word, because Christ truly took human nature. (2) For if what is said of the Son's soul is allegory and we must take the language about it figuratively, then the same has been said of his heart. And finally we will admit that everything about him is appearance and not truth. (3) < Therefore >, according to Arius' contentious argument, the Word cannot have received a heart either when he came—or a liver, flesh, entrails, bones, or anything like that. In the last analysis all of these are allegories and meant figuratively—or else he just received a blob for a body, without any insides. (4) In that case, how could he eat and drink? Forget it! For if the Father speaks of a soul and a heart but in his case the meaning is allegorical and the expression figurative, then < the Arians should also take the heart* > figuratively in the Son's case, since they deny that the Son has taken a soul.

51,5 But if, when pressed, they cannot deny Christ's heart because they admit that the Lord received the whole bodily frame, therefore, given their < admission > that there are two different "hearts," the one admitted to be real and the other allegorical, in the case of Christ's "soul" the word is accurate, and not allegorical or figurative. (6) However, since Christ's human nature is complete in every respect—in body, soul, mind, heart, and everything human except sin—he naturally could do what men do, and yet be entirely complete in Godhead, with impassibility.[196] (7) His Godhead cannot be less glorious than the Father's perfection, but he will be made complete by his human nature and his thirst, hunger, drinking, eating, sleeping, discouragement, while his Godhead is impassible. And again their argument about this has failed, since Christ became flesh while being God.

52,1 But if they say, "If he was of the Father why did he become flesh?" our reply would be, "What do you say about the angels?" For it is plain to everyone that Arians admit the angels were made by the Son. (2) Indeed, they also blaspheme the Holy Spirit by venturing to say that he was created by the Son, although he is uncreate, proceeding from the Father and receiving of the Son. (3) Hence, if they dare to say this of the Holy Spirit,

[196] Holl ἐν ἀπαθείᾳ, MSS ἐν σωτηρίᾳ.

how much more will they be unable to deny in the case of the angels, who are created beings, that they have received their existence from the Only-begotten?

If, then, the angels he created were created spiritual but are his creation in spite of that, and, as his workmanship, are infinitely far below his essence and yet they have not taken flesh—what do you say about that? (4) Are they greater than the Son even though created by him? Or the Holy Spirit too? Why didn't he come to flesh, put on flesh and become man—either the Holy Spirit of God or one of the holy angels? (5) The Son surely did not assume flesh because of an inferiority to the Father. In that case the angels would surely have assumed flesh, or even the Spirit. But since the Son, who is the Father's wisdom, power and Word, had made all things himself with the Father and the Holy Spirit, he assumed flesh (6) to show that the reason for Adam's transgression or disobedience was not that Adam was a creature or that God had made sin, but Adam's own choice, so that [the Son] could carry his righteous judgment through as Isaiah said, "A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench, till he shall carry the judgment through to victory, and in his name shall the gentiles hope"—[197] as David said of him," "Thou shalt be victorious when thou art judged."[198]

52,7 For he was judged in order to silence his opponents by judging justly; for no one will be able to oppose his righteous judgment. For he wore the body and kept it undefiled. For it was certainly not at the instance of the creator, who is not responsible for Adam's sin, that that which was in man, that is, in Adam, from the beginning came to the point of becoming sin with the result that Adam sinned. The creator allowed Adam freedom of choice and each person is responsible for his own sin. (8) And thus, < although he was > not responsible [for sin], the divine Word, the creator, who with his Father and the Holy Spirit created man, the immortal and undefiled Word, became man of his own good pleasure, by some ineffable mystery of wisdom. And in his extreme loving kindness, under no compulsion but of his own free will, he assumed all his creature's characteristics for his creature's sake to "condemn sin in the flesh,"[199] annul the curse on the cross, utterly destroy destruction in the grave, and by descending to hades with soul and Godhead make void the covenant with hades and

197 Isa 42:3–4.
198 Ps 50:6.
199 Rom 8:3.

break "the sting of death."[200] (9) But the ungrateful turn good things completely to bad and no longer thank the kind, perfect, good Son of a good Father for the things for which < one should > thank him. Instead they show ingratitude by attributing frailties to his Godhead, things they are not able to prove, since the truth is evident to everyone.

53,1 And now that these have been expounded I shall go on in turn to other arguments in succession. For they quote the text in the Gospel, "The Father who sent me is greater than I,"[201] with a bad interpretation. In the first place it says, "The Father who *sent* me," not, "the Father who *created* me." (2) For all the sacred scriptures show his true sonship to the Father. They say, "The Father begot me,"[202] "I came forth from the Father and am come,"[203] "I am in the Father and the Father in me,"[204] and, "the Father who sent me."[205] And nowhere have they said, "the Father who created me," or, "the Father who made me."

53,3 And why do they keep heaping up things that are not so? "The Father who sent me is greater than I"—what could be more proper? More cogent? More necessary? More fitting? Who but his true Son, the One begotten of him, is the proper person to glorify the Father? (4) For the Father glorifies the Son and the Son glorifies the Father. And the Son glorifies the Father both to be an example[206] to us, and < for the sake > of his glorification of the Father as one union and glory [with himself], teaching us that his honor is the Father's honor, as he has said, "He that honoreth not the Son as he honoreth the Father, the wrath of God abideth upon him."[207]

53,5 But in what way do Arians think that he is "greater?" In bulk? Time? Height? Age? Worth? Which of these is in God, for us to conceive of? Time does not apply to the Godhead, so that < the > Son who is begotten of the Father but not in time, might be considered inferior. Nor does the Godhead allow for advancement, or the Son might achieve the Father's greatness by advancing to it. (6) For if the Son of God is called the Son of God as the result of advancement, then he [once] had many equals and advanced by being called higher in rank, but was [once] lower than someone who

200 1 Cor 15:56.
201 John 4:34 and 14:28.
202 Cf. Ps 109:3.
203 John 16:28.
204 John 14:10.
205 John 4:34.
206 John 4:34 and 14:28.
207 Cf. John 5:23; John 3:36.

outranked him. (7) But the scripture says, "Who shall be likened unto the Lord among the sons of God?"[208] since all things are termed sons colloquially, but he alone is Son by nature, not grace—for "He hath found out every path of understanding, and none shall be declared his equal."[209]

But what do Arians say? "The Father surpasses the Son in elevation." (8) Where is the Godhead located? Or is it bounded by space so that "bigger" might be shown by circumference? < Forget it*>, "God is spirit!"[210] And their heretical invention is a complete failure. Let us pass this by too, beloved, and go on to the rest of their arguments.

54,1 For they say that the sender is not like the sent, but that sender and sent differ in power because the one sends, while the other is sent. And if the meaning of the truth were what they say, the whole subject of our knowledge could not be traced to one unity of truth, power and Godhead. (2) For if two were meeting or two were sending, the Son would no longer be a son, but a brother—who had another brother, no longer a father.[211] But if they were related by identity or adoption, or if one were to send himself, or if the two sent together or arrived together, they would show that there are two Godheads and not one unity. (3) But here there is a Sender and a Sent, showing that there is one Source[212] of all good things, the Father; but next after the Source comes One who—to correspond with his name of Son and Word, and not with any other—is one Source springing from a Source, the Son come forth, ever with the Father but begotten < without beginning and not in time as the scripture says* >, "For with thee is the source of life."[213] (4) And to show the same of the Holy Spirit < it adds >, "In thy light shall we see light," showing that the Father is light, the Son is the Father's light, and the Holy Spirit is light and a Source springing from a Source, [that is], from the Father and the Only-begotten—the Holy Spirit. "For out of his belly shall flow rivers of water springing up unto eternal life; but," says the Gospel, "he said this of the Holy Spirit."[214]

54,5 And again, to teach his disciples his co-essentiality with the Father, he says, "If any man open to me, I and my Father will come in

---

208 Ps 88:7.
209 Bar 3:36.
210 John 4:24.
211 Perhaps cf. Ath. Or. I C. Ar. 14.
212 Perhaps cf. Ath. Or. I 14.
213 Ps 35:10.
214 John 7:38; (4:14); 7:39.

and make our abode with him."[215] And [here] he no longer said, "I shall be sent by my Father," but, "I and my Father will < make our abode > with him," with the Son knockimg and the Father enterimg with him, so that it is everlasting, and neither is the Father separated from the Son nor the Son separated from his Father. (6) And so he says in another passage, "I am the way, and by me shall they go in unto the Father."[216] And lest it be thought that < he > is less than the Father because they go in to the Father by him, he says, "No man can come unto me unless my heavenly Father draw him."[217] (7) Thus the Father brings him to the Son and the Son brings him to the Father, but brings him in the Holy Spirit. The Trinity is forever eternal, one unity of Godhead, three Perfects, one Godhead. And the Arians' argument has failed.

55,1 But again, they say, "Why did Christ tell his disciples, 'I go unto my Father and your Father, and unto my God and your God'?[218] If he acknowledges him as his God, how can he be his equal or legitimately begotten of him as Son?"—showing that they are entirely ignorant of God, and in no way "illumined by the light of the Gospel."[219]

55,2 Always, and in every generation, one who has examined and investigated will know the meaning of the truth of the perfect knowledge of our Savior and of his equality with the Father. But these people itch from being wrapped up in Jewish thinking, and are annoyed with the Son of God just as the Jews said, "For no evil deed do we stone thee, but that thou, being a man, callest thyself Son of God, making thyself equal with God."[220] (3) They are annoyed too because they have gotten into the same state as the Jews[221] and Pharisees, and will not call the Son equal to the Sire who begot him.

55,4 For observe the accuracy of the scriptures! The sacred scripture never used this expression before the incarnation. The Father says "Let us make man"[222] to the Son, calling the Son his fellow creator and showing that he is his own Son and equal. (5) And the Son never said, "my God and your God," < before the incarnation, but* >, "And Adam heard the

---

215 Rev 3:20.
216 Cf. John 14:23.
217 John 6:44.
218 John 20:17.
219 1 Cor 15:34; 2 Cor 4:4.
220 John 10:33.
221 Cf. Ath. Or. I 8.
222 Gen 1:26.

voice of God walking in the garden,[223] and < "God said to Noah >, Make to thyself an ark of acacia wood,"[224] and, "The Lord rained from the Lord,"[225] and "The Lord said unto Moses, I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob";[226] and David says, "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand."[227] And the Lord never said, "my God and your God."

55,6 But when he had taken our body, "appeared on earth and consorted with men,"[228] and become one of us, then he said "my God and your God, and my Father and your Father" to his disciples, whom it was his duty to be like in all respects except sin: "my Father" by nature in the Godhead, and "your Father" by grace because of me, in the adoption. "My God" because I have taken your flesh, and "your God" by nature and in truth. (7) And thus everything is crystal clear, and nothing in the sacred scripture is contradictory or has any taint of death, as the Arians pretend in concocting their wicked arguments. But again, I think this has been sufficiently explained, and shall next go on to the rest.

56,1 For again, they say that the Holy Spirit is the creature of a creature because of, "By the Son all things were made,"[229] as the scripture says– stupidly seizing on certain lines, not reading the text as it is worded but, with wrong suppositions and apart from the text misinterpreting, in terms of their wrong supposition, something that has been correctly said. (2) For the divine Gospel did not say this of the Holy Spirit. It said of all created things that anything which is created was made through the Word and by the Word. If you read further, the line, "All things were made through him, and without him was not one thing made," includes the words, "that was made," to make it clear that all [created] things were made by him, and not a single thing without him.

56,3 Then again it says, "In him was life."[230] For here too the sequence of St. John's [expressions] must be made complete as he goes on with his confessions that non-existent things < have been made >[231] in existent ones. For "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,

---

223 Gen 3:8.
224 Gen 6:13–14.
225 Gen 19:24.
226 Exod 3:6.
227 Ps 109:1.
228 Bar 3:38.
229 Cf. John 1:3.
230 John 1:4.
231 Holl γεγενημένα, MSS πεπληρωμένος.

and the Word was God."[232] (4) Since [he says] "was," and was," and "In him was life,"[233] and "that *was* the true light,"[234] and "He *was* in the world"[235] and all < the rest* >, the blessed John, by the Holy Spirit's inspiration, is making it plain with this "was" that "All *that was made*, was made through him."[236] But the Maker of all the things that were made is prior to them all.

56,5 However, the scripture says that all things were made through him but did not say what the things that were made were. For there was never any supposition of wickedness, so that no one could suppose things that were not true and blaspheme God's changeless and unalterable Holy Spirit. (6) It is on their account that the Lord says, "If any man say a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him. But if any man say aught against the Holy Spirit it shall not be forgiven him, neither here nor in the world to come."[237] For the whole of their argument is ridiculous.

56,7 One might, however, answer them in terms of their blasphemous supposition and say, "You hotshot sophists and word-twisters who want to count God's Holy Spirit as a creature on account of, 'All things were made through him,' because of 'all things,' although the Holy Spirit is never counted in with 'all things!' (8) You should suppose, then, in terms of your blasphemous supposition—if, indeed, there is anyone else who is worse than you—that the Father too was made through the Son." For the line which says that all things were made through him is comprehensive. (9) But if it is blasphemous to think any such thing of the Father, and foolish, the like applies to those who suspect it of the Holy Spirit, who belongs with the Father and the Son.

56,10 For if he were were a thing that is made he would not be reckoned in with the uncreated Father and the uncreated Son. But because he is uncreated he is so reckoned; the scripture said, "Go baptize in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."[238] And how can the Spirit be created when it is testified of him that "He proceeded from the Father"[239] and "received of me,"[240] and through him man's full

[232] John 1:1.
[233] John 1:4.
[234] John 1:9.
[235] John 1:10.
[236] Cf. John 1:3.
[237] Matt 12:32.
[238] Matt 28:19.
[239] John 15:26.
[240] John 16:15.

salvation, and everything required for the human nature, was made complete. (11) For scripture says of the Lord, "God anointed him with the Holy Spirit."[241] But the Father would not have anointed Christ's human nature, which had been united in one Godhead with the divine Word, with a creature. However, since the Trinity is one, three Perfects, one Godhead, this needed to be done for the Son in the dispensation of the incarnation, so that the Trinity, completely glorified in all things, would be observed to be < one >. I have cited no [mere] one or two texts against all the sects in my discussions of the Spirit, to prove that he is the Spirit of God, glorified with the Father and the Son, uncreated, changeless and perfect. And, in its turn, the argument against themselves that the trouble-makers < have invented > about him has proved a failure.

57,1 But again, let's devote our attention to their other arguments. For they say in turn, though they do not have a sound understanding of the text, that the Savior himself said, "Why callest thou me good? There is one good, God,"[242] and thereby separated himself from the essence and subsistence of the Father.

But this whole thing is foolish. (2) If they do not think that the One who has done so much for us is good, who else is < good? But what > could be worse than this, that the One who gave his life for the sheep; who went willingly to the passion although he was the impassible God; who secured the forgiveness of sins for us; who worked cures in all Israel; who, of his own goodness, brought such a numerous people, in goodness, to the Father—that the Promoter of goodness and Lord of peace, the Father's good word begotten on high of the good Father, the Giver of food to all flesh, the Author of all goodness for men and all his creatures, is not considered good by the Arians!

57,3 And since they have managed to forget it, they do not know that he threw the questioner's word back at him in order to humble the overweening insolence in him. A scribal type was boasting that he had exactly fulfilled the requirements of the Law. And to parade his own righteousness and goodness he said, "Good Master, what [more could] I do to inherit eternal life?" (4) And since he thought of himself as < endowed > with such great righteousness, the Lord, wishing to ascribe all goodness to God so that no fleshly being would indulge in vanity, said, "Why callest thou me good? None is good save God." By saying such a thing when he was

241 Acts 10:38.
242 Mark 10:18.

what he was and as great as he was, he intended to humble the arrogance of the speaker with his supposed righteousness, and expose what was in his heart, for with his lips he called him a good teacher, but he did not abide by his good teaching.

57,5 And that he is good he teaches us himself by saying, "Many good works have I done among you; for which of them do ye stone me?"[243] To whom is this not clear and plain as day, particularly as many of his creatures are, and are called good, as the sacred scripture says? (6) See here, the sacred text tells of many good things. It says, "Saul, the son of Kish, of the tribe of Benjamin, was a good man, and from the shoulders and upward higher than all the people."[244]

And "Samuel" was "good with the Lord and men"[245] And "The last word was better than the beginning."[246] And, "Open thy good treasure, the heavenly."[247] (7) But since these are creatures, and are shown by himself and his creatures to be good, how can it not be indisputably good to confess that the author of their being is good? But < not > to prolong the discussion of this—I have spoken extensively of it everywhere—I shall once again go on to the next, and give the explanation of each expression.

58,1 But these people who will try anything cite some other texts to sow the suspicion that there are defects in their Redeemer—if, indeed, they have been redeemed. For when the mother of the sons of Zebedee approached Jesus and begged that the one son should sit on his right and the other on his left when he came in his kingdom, he told them, "Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink the cup that I shall drink of? And they said, Yea. We are able. And he said to them, Ye shall drink of my cup, but to sit on my right hand or on my left is not mine to give, but is for them for whom it is prepared of my Father."[248] (2) "Do you see," they say, "how he has no authority independent of the Father's, who has the authority to give it to anyone he chooses?"

And who in his right mind would think such a thing? If the Son does not have authority, who does? "For," he says, "the Father giveth life to the dead, and thus he hath granted the Son to give life to whom he will";[249]

---

243 John 10:32.
244 1 Kms 9:2.
245 1 Kms 2:27.
246 Eccles 7:9.
247 Deut 28:12.
248 Matt 20:22–23.
249 John 5:21.

and, "All things have been delivered unto me of my Father."[250] (3) Who could have any further doubt? But his sacred, wise saying is meant to show that nothing is awarded from respect of persons, but in accord with merit. For to grant is the Lord's prerogative, but he grants to each according to his deserts. Each who has done something right receives < from the Lord > in accordance with his labor; and not mere giving is his sole prerogative, but giving to one who has made himself worthy.

58,4 For I venture to say that giving [as such] is not the Lord's prerogative although he has the power, but he does not wish [simply] to give. Nor is it the Holy Spirit's although the Holy Spirit has the power to give, as the scripture says, "To one is given wisdom by the Spirit, to another divers kinds of tongues by the same Spirit, to another the interpretation of tongues, to another power, to another teaching, but it is one Spirit that divideth to every man as he will."[251] And it didn't say, "as he is directed," but, "as he will." (5) And "The Son giveth life to whom he will,"[252] and "The Father calleth whom he will to the Son."[253] And again, neither the Father and the Son, nor the Holy Spirit, calls, gives, provides or awards from respect of persons, but as each person renders himself worthy; this is the meaning of, "It is not mine to give, but if you toil it will be prepared for you by my Father." But < I shall give* > at the End, for "I am the life."[254] And I shall go right on to the others.

59,1 They say, "Why do you say that he is of the Father's perfect Godhead? See here, the apostle says of him that 'God hath raised him from the dead.'[255] If he needs God's help to raise him from the dead, then there is one person who raises him by his power; but the other person, the one who is raised by the power of the One who is able to do this, is inferior."

59,2 And how long must I tire myself out with the silly ideas of the people who give themselves headaches? Who raised Lazarus? Who raised the widow's son at Nain? Who said, "Qumi talitha, Get up, child," to the daughter of the ruler of the synagogue? On whose name did the apostles call, and the dead were raised?

I suppose the apostles < said this to show* > that all this had been done at the Father's good pleasure, by the will of the Son and with the consent

---

250 Matt 11:27.
251 Cf. 1 Cor 12:8; 10; 11.
252 John 5:21.
253 Cf. John 6:44.
254 John 11:25.
255 Rom 4:24.

of the Holy Spirit, because the apostles were in a dispute with Jews who thought that they were preaching apostasy from the God of the Law, and because they had received[256] from the Holy Spirit the knowledge that sects would set Christ in opposition to the will of the Father. (4) But this is not said to show any defect or weakness, or any difference between the divine Word's essence and the Father's. There are no differences. See, in the first instance, how the angel describes him when he asks Mary and the others, "Why seek ye the living among the dead?"[257] You see, he who was alive had risen in his Godhead and flesh; he was not with the dead. And what does the angel say to them? "He is risen. He is not here."[258] He didn't say, "God has raised him and is he not here?" but to show the power of the Savior he said that he had risen even living.

59,5 And again, he himself told his disciples before his passion, "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and the Son of Man shall be delivered to be crucified, and the third day he shall rise again."[259] (6) And he didn't say, "< God > will raise him." But he was plainly showing beforehand the control [over resurrection] of his power by saying, "I have power to lay my soul down, and power to take it."[260] (7) But since he had the power, why couldn't he raise himself? When the apostle wrote, "God raised him from the dead,"[261] he said it to show that nothing in the economy of salvation has taken place without the Father's will. For the apostle himself says in another passage, "Even though he died from weakness, he lives by power."[262]

59,8 If I could only pick the brains of these people who know all about the scripture, [and find] which weakness the Only-begotten had—[the Only-begotten] by whom the heaven has been spread out; by whom the sun was lit; (9) by whom the stars shone; by whom all things have been made from nothing. Which weakness does the apostle mean? Isn't it the weakness the Word assumed when he came in our flesh, putting it on so as to bear our weakness? As the prophet's oracle about him says, "He took our weaknesses and bare our illnesses."[263] He who is life and the impassible God died because of our weakness in the flesh which we had made

---

256 Holl προσ<δέξασθαι> τὸ γνωστόν, MS πρὸς τὸ γνωστόν.
257 Luke 24:5.
258 Luke 24:6.
259 Matt 20:18–19.
260 John 10:18.
261 1 Cor 15:15; Rom 4:24.
262 Cf. 2 Cor 13:4.
263 Isa 53:4.

weaker [yet], but he lives by power. "For the Word is living and active and sharper than any two-edged sword."[264] (10) Thus he died from weakness and lives by the power of his Godhead; but he lives in our flesh in which he accepted the passion. And it was because of this dispensation that the apostle said, "God raised him from the dead,"[265] to give token of the Father's good pleasure.

60,1 They cite still another text from the Gospel according to Luke, one which is marvelous, choice, and in every way most useful. Which text? When the Lord, by his own will, was about to enter upon the passion, taking the disciples into the mount at that time he "went apart from them about a stone's cast, and went and prayed and said, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me that I drink it not. Nevertheless, not what I will, but what thou wilt."[266]

60,2 And first, once more these people pretend and say, "Do you see how he speaks coaxingly and shows a will that is distinguished from the Father's by saying, 'Not what I will, but what thou wilt?' How can it be the same essence," they ask, "when there is one will in him, but another in the Father?"

And they are ignorant of the entire meaning of this. For this is why the apostle said, "O the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God!"[267] (3) And how could Christ be speaking of a will of his own beside the Father's will when he himself tells his disciples, "My soul is troubled, and what shall I say, 'Father, save me from this hour?' "[268] as though he were speaking in advance about the text [in question], and using the words, "What shall I say, 'Father, save me from this hour?' " in a way that was equivocal? He means, "Should I say [such a thing as] this? For *for this cause* came I unto this hour."[269] (4) He came, not unwillingly but willingly. For earlier he says, "I have a cup to drink, and how eager I am to drink it! And I have a baptism to be baptized with, and what will I if I were already baptized!"[270] If he is willing and eager, then, and says that he has come for this purpose, how can he be showing that he has one will, and the Father has another? (5) And, being kindly and willing to

---

264 Heb 4:12.
265 1 Cor 15:15; Rom 4:24.
266 Luke 22:41–42.
267 Rom 11:33.
268 John 12:27.
269 John 4:27.
270 Matt 20:22; Luke 12:50.

spare Abraham's seed, since he would be betrayed by Israel he was putting in a word for the people.

However, it was the Father's will that his provision be executed in this way by the children of Israel, although they were accessory to their own betrayal of the Son and not compelled to it by God; and the Son's will was not different from the Father's. (6) But it was essential that he show this even here to ascribe the whole of the divine unity to the Father, leaving no division between the one unity and human nature.

61,1 And Arius adds next that " 'being in agony while he prayed,' " < as > we find in the Gospel according to Luke, and " 'He sweat, and his sweat was as it were drops of blood falling to the ground. And there appeared an angel of the Lord strengthening him.' "[271] (2) Those nit-pickers jump up at once as though they had found an opening against an enemy, and add, "Do you see that he even needed the strength of angels? An angel strengthened him, for he was in agony."

And they have no idea that if he did not have all these things, including "Not my will, but thine," the human nature of Christ would have been an illusion; and if Christ had not been in agony and sweat had not poured from his body, there would be some sense in the theory of the unreality of the human nature that Manichaeans and Marcionites yap about, < since Christ would be an apparition > and not absolutely real. (3) But < he did > all these things to make our salvation sure < because > he assumed everything < that is ours >, and as concessions said certain things, in truth, not deceit, that reflected human frailty. < For example >, [he said] "not my will," to show the reality of his flesh, confound those who say he has no human mind, and frustrate the people who deny that he has flesh.

61,4 For every divine word, standing firm amid the sons of darkness, confounds the darkness but enlightens the sons of the truth. See how much helpful material there is in this saying. No sweat comes from bodiless beings. In this way he showed that his flesh was real and not an apparition. < And > without a soul and a mind there can be no agony of a flesh that is united to the Godhead. By experiencing agony he showed that he had soul, body and mind at once, which is why he could show agony. (5) And again, by saying, "not my will, but thine," he revealed a mind truly human though without sin.

For his Godhead is always in the Father, the Father is in the Son, and the Son is in the Holy Spirit, perfectly possessing all things, and the Son's

[271] Luke 22:44; 43.

intent is no different from the Father's nor the Father's from the Son's, or the Holy Spirit's from the Father's and the Son's. (6) If the Son desires what the Father does not will, he will indeed be a mere man as you say and, from inferiority, < subject > to the will of the Father. But this is not the case, never think it! By speaking of things that are reflective of human frailty he shows the reality of his incarnation and the perfection of his human nature, so that he will be our salvation in every way and we will not perceive one thing in place of another and be deprived of the truth.

62,1 But as to his being seen to be strengthened by angels, what could be more proper than this? What more necessary? See, we have found the application of the passage in the great Song written by Moses, "Let my utterance be awaited as the rain,"[272] and shortly afterwards, "Let all the sons of God worship him, and all the angels of God strengthen him"[273]—(2) not so that the angels may give him strength. He did not need the strengthening of the angels. They "strengthen" him in the sense of giving him the due acknowledgment of his strength. (3) Indeed, for all our weakness we too have often blessed God, often strengthened God—not because God needs our blessing, but we acknowledge the power of his blessing. And we say, giving the full particulars, "Thine is the power, thine the might, thine the honor, thine the glory, thine the blessing, thine the strength, thine the power." (4) Not that we provide God with strength by saying "Thine is the might, thine the power, thine the blessing," not that we have given God power, have blessed God. But by corroboration and confirmation we have confessed the power (δύναμιν) of God and ascribed the strength (ἰσχύν) to God.

62,5 Thus the angel too was amazed at that time, and astonished at the abundance of his Master's loving kindness because, although he was God, and was worshiped in heaven with the Father, and served by his own angels, he submitted to such a < depth* > [of humiliation] as to come willingly by his own desire and assume flesh—(6) and not only this, but < also > submitted to suffering, even to consignment to the cross, for his own creation, the human race, "tasting death, even the death of the cross,"[274] so that humankind could win the trophy against death through

[272] Deut 32:2.
[273] Deut 32:43.
[274] Cf. Phil 2:8.

him, "destroy him that had the power of death, even the devil,"[275] and "triumph over every rule and authority."[276]

62,7 And so, in amazement and awe, to glorify and praise his Master as he stood in such an arena and with such remarkable deeds, the angel said to him, "Thine is the worship, thine the might, thine the power, thine the strength," in fulfillment of the words that Moses had written, "Let all God's angels give him strength."[277]

62,8 And you see, servants of Christ and sons of God's holy church and orthodox faith, that there is nothing obscure or knotty in the sacred scripture; everything has been written marvelously and marvelously fulfilled for our salvation. However, in their hostility to God's only-begotten Son and the Holy Spirit, Arians, like enemies, think up all sorts of plans and subtleties. (9) But far be it from us to rely on human subtleties. We must keep our minds sound to glorify our Master and not conceive of any defect in him. For if the One who came to save all things has any defect, how can creation be saved from its own defects?

63,1 Again, in their search for some text or other against the Savior, this new crop of Jews who are springing up again—for they are votaries of the Jewish opinion and no different from Jews except merely in name—they seize, like adversaries, on something else "to entangle him in his talk,"[278] as the Gospel has said. (2) "On the cross," they say, he said, 'Eli, Eli, lema sabachthani, that is, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' " And "You see him piteously begging and wailing," they say, "and saying, 'Why hast thou forsaken me?' "[279] (3) And those whose minds are torpid from the poison of Arius' madness, and who have no knowledge of God, do not know that all the human frailties in the Lord are to be confessed [as residing] in his true human nature.

63,4 In the first place, they do not realize that they are jumping from one thing to another in their thinking about him and have no fixed position. How can they, when they are not sound in mind? For they will sometimes call the Savior himself Lord, Christ, before all ages, Master of angels and archangels, through whom all things were made—principalities and authorities, angels and archangels, the heavens and all things, the earth, all humanity and everything on earth, the sea and all that is in it. (5) How

275 Heb 2:14.
276 Col 2:15.
277 Deut 32:43.
278 Matt 22:15.
279 Matt 27:46.

foolish of them to say such glorious things of him and not realize that < He who > in his Godhead < is > before the ages cannot say such a thing as, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"[280] here in the person of his Godhead—He by whom heaven and earth were made, and angels and archangels, and in a word, all things visible and invisible.

63,6 When was the Son forsaken by the Father, and when was the Son not in the Father and the Father not in the Son? For he came to earth as the Son and the divine Word, and yet he touched heaven, and all his enemies were filled with his glory. And he was in Mary and was made man, and yet filled all things by his power. (7) How could such a person, and One of such greatness, say piteously, "Eli, Eli, lema sabachthani, that is, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" in his divine nature, though it was he himself who said, "I shall come again and shall not leave you desolate, but I shall come unto you."[281] And he says again in another passage, "Verily I say unto you, All ye shall be offended because of me this night, and ye shall all leave me alone, and yet I am not alone, but the Father who begot me is with me."[282] 8) And again, "I go, and I shall send unto you the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, who proceedeth from the Father and receiveth of me."[283] And again, in another passage, he says, "I knock, and if any man open to me, we shall come unto him, I and my Father, and make our abode with him."[284] This is as much as to say that he is not forsaken by the Father, but that the Father is always with the Son, just as the Holy Spirit is always with the Father and the Son.

64,1 "Well then," they say, "what did he mean when he said, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' " But who cannot see that the words are uttered in the person of his human nature, reflecting human frailty? (2) His human nature [said this], though not by itself. (He never spoke from a separate divine nature and a separate human nature, as though < he were > sometimes the one and sometimes the other. He spoke with his manhood united with his Godhead as one holiness and therefore possessed of perfect knowledge in it.) Appropriately for the manhood which had been united with God and joined to one divine nature, but which now saw its Godhead, with its soul, impelled to leave its holy body, it < pronounced the words > in the person of the Lord-man, that is, in the person

280 Matt 27:46.
281 John 16:7; 14:18.
282 Cf. Matt 26:31; John 16:32.
283 Cf. John 16:7; 14; 15:26.
284 Rev 3:20.

of his human nature. (3) For the divine nature was about to accomplish all that the mystery of the passion involved and descend to the underworld with his soul, to secure the salvation there of all who had previously fallen asleep, I mean the holy patriarchs. Thus, when it was so impelled, Christ's voice said, in the person of the human nature [speaking] to his divine nature itself, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"[285]

65,4 But this had to be, in order to fulfill, through him, the prophecies the sacred scriptures had made of him through his own prophets. And it was in fulfillment of the words against Hades which are said to Hades, seemingly by the man, so that though the archon Hades and Death intended to subdue a man he would unknowingly < seize > the < holy > Godhead < concealed > in the soul, and Hades himself would be subdued and death destroyed, fulfilling the saying, "Thou shalt not leave my soul in Hades, neither shalt thou suffer thine holy one so see corruption."[286]

65,5 For neither did the holy divine Word abandon the soul, nor was his soul abandoned in Hades. Unceasingly, the holy Trinity provides for all aspects of so great a mystery—the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, with the Son < become > fleshly but the Father incorporeal, and the Son, although unchangeable, incarnate by his own good pleasure and < made > flesh by the will of the incorporeal Holy Spirit. But all these provisions were made by the holy Trinity for the salvation of humankind.

66,1[287] And so, in turn, he says in another passage, "Why hast thou forsaken me?" and here he says, "I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee."[288] For < his > body needed to spend the three days in the grave in order to fulfill the sayings, "And I was free among the dead"[289] and "They cast me, the beloved, out like a loathed carcass."[290] This was also in fulfillment of "Thou shalt not suffer thine holy one to see corruption,"[291] (to show his holiness through his body), and < "Thou shalt not leave my soul in Hades" >, (to show that his soul was not left in hades either). (2) For the divine Word was in it throughout his sojourn in Hades, in fulfillment of the apostle's saying, "It was impossible for him to be holden of hades."[292]

---

285 Matt 27:46.
286 Ps 15:10.
287 The chapter numbering in Holl-Lietzmann does not include a chapter 65.
288 Heb 13:5.
289 Ps 87:5.
290 This citation is not identifiable.
291 Ps 15:10.
292 Acts 2:24.

66,3 And why does scripture say, "impossible," except that Death and Hades was eager to detain a soul but that, because of his Godhead, it was impossible for his soul to be detained? But if his soul could not be detained because of his Godhead, how could, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"[293] be said in the person of his Godhead? (4) This saying was given in the person of the manhood, in terms of human frailty, to teach us that Christ was incarnate truly, and not in seeming or appearance.

66,5 But what arose from the earth, other than the body that had fallen asleep? "He is risen," says the scripture, "he is not here."[294] And what was it that had arisen except a body? It was a body, then, that was in the grave, but the soul had departed with the divine Word. (6) And again, Christ accomplished his perfect resurrection all together, in the same Godhead, the same soul, the same holy body, and then united his whole self in one spiritual union—one union of Godhead, one provision, one fullness. In the ninety-second Psalm it says, "The Lord hath reigned, he hath put on comeliness,"[295] meaning the divine Word's entry from the heavens into the world having put on comeliness, that is, with the flesh that was born of a Virgin.

66,6 For since he seemed of little account to his unbelieving beholders comeliness was ascribed to him to show his power which, through the seeming weakness of the flesh, overcame the arbiter < of death. For he arose* > after abolishing < the curse* > of sin—that is, death—and after, in a comely fashion, accomplishing the entire provision for our salvation, after doing away with corruption and the curse, annulling the writ against us and the covenant with Hades, and making all the provisions for the salvation of humankind. (7) For directly after it says, "The Lord hath reigned, he hath put on comeliness," the scripture makes a further addition and repeats it, saying, "The Lord hath put on, and hath been girded about, with strength."[296] This is to show that his first garment came from Mary, but that his further clothing the second time came from the resurrection of the dead; (8) for as the sacred scripture has said, he is "the firstborn from the dead."[297] This is why he adds a further assurance by this second donning of a garment and says, "The Lord hath put on, and hath been girded about, with strength."

---

293 Matt 27:46.
294 Mark 16:6.
295 Ps 92:1.
296 Ps 92:1.
297 Col 1:18.

67,1 For as a person with his waist belted tightens his garment about his loins, making his appearance trimmer and bringing the garment close to his own skin, so Christ "girded on comeliness" for the first time because of his sojourn here in the flesh. But the second time he "put on strength," as the scripture says, by rising from the dead. His manhood is no longer subject to suffering, no longer subject to scourging, can no longer be crucified, as the apostle said of him, "He is risen, he dieth no more, death hath no more dominion over him."[298] (2) This is why it says, "He was girded"—[that is], by uniting his flesh with one Godhead, a single oneness, < one > spirit, the divine and the bodily one as a spiritual whole, indissoluble. Thus, then, he entered where doors were barred, < proving > his grossness ethereal and his passibility impassible, for he had suffered in the flesh while retaining his impassibility. (3) [Even so] after entering he displayed bones and flesh, the mark of the lance and the marks of the nails, was felt by Thomas and seen by the disciples. But he entered where doors were barred to show that, for us men, he had made one spiritual unity of the whole of his saving work.

67,4 And why do I tire myself with so much talk? To say "the same things" often "is not grievous to me, but" for my readers < "it is safe."[299] Therefore* >, since I have often thought of < the same thing* > for your safety I have put it down as a way of getting through the savage attack of Arius' thoughts, words and suppositions.

68,1 And now that I have likewise discussed this expression sufficiently, let me go on to the rest in order, by fully explaining most of their foolishness that comes to my mind, to show, from a few texts or even more, that for one who has the Holy Spirit and has received a sober mind from the Lord, nothing crooked can be suspected anywhere in the sacred scripture, and no sort of frailty in the Father, the Son or the Holy Spirit. (2) Everything has been said, in truth, in the sacred scripture, with entire perfection and with provision for every need and for what is required in every passage, by the Lord himself and his holy apostles and prophets whom he has sent.

68,3 For indeed, the Lord made a prophesy of this when he said, "Eli, Eli, lema sabachthani" in Hebrew. The Lord, come to the cross, was duly finishing the saying by saying what had been prophesied of him, "Eli, Eli," in Hebrew as it had already been written; and [then], in adding the companion phrase he said, "lema sabachthani," no longer in Hebrew but in

298 Rom 6:9.
299 Phil 3:1.

Aramaic, so as to begin as it had been written of him but in going on change the rest of the line to another language. (4) This too he was doing to make a good provision. By saying, "Eli, Eli," he meant to acknowledge that the words had been spoken of him by the prophet. But by saying the rest no longer in Hebrew but in Aramaic, he meant to humble < the pride > of those who boast of Hebrew, and to declare that other languages too are fit for the fulfillment of the oracles about him. (5) For he was now to extend the knowledge of himself to all nations, not just the Hebrews, as this whole series [of expressions] in the twenty-first Psalm[300] indicates when, in the person of his human nature, it records all the frailty of his humanity.

68,6 But, come [to the cross], he was completely fulfilling the description himself, just as < every point > in the whole of the psalm, one after another, corresponds with the humanity of Christ which it is describing. It says, "And they parted my garments,"[301] and, "They pierced my hands and my feet, they stared and looked upon me."[302] And as many other such things are said, which cannot possibly apply to his Godhead, but are said in the flesh—although the Godhead, impassibly and in truth, has made provision of them all.

69,1 But they leap up again, like mad dogs in the grip of some frenzy which, because of their frenzy, do not know their master and attack him first. When we tell them truly that the Lord in the Gospel said of his disciples, "Those whom thou hast given me, Father, I have kept in the world,"[303] (2) and again, "Make them to be one in me, as I and thou are one,"[304] they reply, "Can't you see that in the words, 'I am in the Father and the Father in me, and we two are one?'[305] he is not speaking of equality but of concord? (3) How could the disciples be in him by equality? But they could be in him by concord."

And God's truth refutes them completely at once, since the disciples could not do this, and it could not be said of them, if the Word had not come and shared their flesh, and united them in him for adoption as sons. (4) Thus everywhere in the Song of Songs, he calls his holy church "neighbor," addresses her with his holy voice of arousal and admonition, and

---

300 Cf. Ps 21:26–32.
301 Ps 21:19.
302 Ps 21:17; 18.
303 John 17:11–12.
304 John 17:21.
305 John 14:6; 10:30.

says, "Rise up and come, my neighbor, my fair one, my dove!"[306] (5) And do you see how he calls her "neighbor?" But the church could not be called Christ's "neighbor" if he had not come from above and drawn near to her, through the flesh with frailties like hers which he had taken, so as to gather those who had obediently drawn near him and call the humanity which had become near to him his holy and spotless bride.

69,6 And this is why the Word, our Lord the Only-begotten, here prays the Father that his disciples may be in him, so that, when the disciples have been sanctified, he may join the kinship with him through the flesh which has become theirs by the Father's good pleasure, into a oneness of good will and adoption and, in the Father's Firstborn, they may have "enrollment with the firstborn in heaven."[307] (7) And lest anyone suppose that the Son has been changed from his Father's glory by donning the flesh, to confirm their faith and knowledge of his truth, so that < no one > becomes suspicious of his servants and is deprived of his hope, he says, "that as I and thou are one, so these may be one. (8) For I and thou are one"[308]—since < he is > God of God, and co-essential [with the Father] in Godhead.

69.9 And "We are one," is not indicative of a unit. He did not say, "I am one," but, "I and thou." And "We are one" is said to confound Sabellius and his school, since Sabellius thinks that the Son and the Father are an identity and the Father and the Holy Spirit likewise. For that is why he said, "We are one," and did not say, "I am one." There are two Perfects, a Father and a Son, but one because of equality, by their < one > Godhead, one power and one likeness. (10) In the Godhead the Father and Son are one, in the manhood the Son and the disciples are one, brought to one union of adoption by his deigning to call the disciples to the ineffability of his lovingkindness. And once again there has been a refutation of those who in vain think wrongly of their Master.

70,1 But let me pass this text by too and examine the rest. Since they spend their time on syllogisms and nonsensical reasonings and, although they are men, try to out-argue God, the sophists, when they discover one text or another, jump right up. The prophet reproved them by saying, "Will someone trip God because you can trip me?"[309]

---

306 Cant 2:10.
307 Cf. Heb 12:23.
308 John 17:21; 10:30.
309 Mal 3:8.

70,2 Well, what do the great guys have to say now? The same talking point which I explained earlier they [now] direct at me in the form of a query, "Did God beget the Son by willing it or without willing it?"[310] I have shown that to God there is no future, (3) but that in him all things are complete at once. He does not will a thing first before doing it; nor does he do it without willing it or will a thing in preparation for it, and his preparation does not require will. (4) Thus with him his Offspring is always begotten with no beginning in time. It is always with the Father as an Offspring begotten, and never ceases to be such. Since I have repeated the argument here, I again make the statement that the Father did not beget the Son either by willing it or without willing it, but in his nature which transcends will. For the Son is < the offspring > of a nature beyond will and above all conception and supposition.

71,1 But these latter day disciples of Aristotle, as I said, invent another argument similar to this one. For they have imitated Aristotle's poison and abandoned the harmlessness and meekness of the Holy Spirit, as the Lord says, "Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest for your souls."[311] (2) But these people have abandoned meekness and gone in for cleverness instead, taking up Aristotle and the other secular dialecticians. Contentious as they are, they go after the fruits of dialecticians but know no fruit of righteousness and have not been privileged to have the gift of the Holy Spirit within them.

71,3 Now here is what they say to us, when we tell them that the Son Who Is was with the Father Who Is—since the Father said to Moses, "Thou shalt say unto them, He Who Is hath sent me,"[312] and again, the Gospel says of the Son that "In the beginning *was* the Word, and the Word *was with* God, and the Word *was* God."[313] If we tell them that He Who Is was with Him Who Is, they ask us, "Well now, was that which is begotten, or that which isn't? If he 'was,' why was he begotten? But if he was begotten, how come he 'was?' "

71,4 And < this > is the product of the same foolishness which is preoccupied with philosophical questions, has its head in the clouds, "meddles with things in the heavens, and does no good."[314]

---

310 26, 5–6.
311 Matt 11:29.
312 Exod 3:14.
313 John 1:1.
314 Cf. 2 Thes 3:11.

For we shall ask them, "What gave you this idea of thinking these things?" (5) But if they tell us, "Our mind requires us to examine them," we for our part shall say, "All right, you people, tell us, are you reasoning about your own affairs, or about God's?"

Then they say, "We're reasoning about God's on our own initiative, as rational beings."

"Well, isn't God different from your condition, nature and essence?"

"Yes," they reply.

"Well, if God's nature is different from yours, then in the first place your nature can't comprehend things about God that are incomprehensible. And in the second, it is an impiety to model God on yourselves, in terms of your own essence."

71,6 For in our own case, something that does not exist is begotten [and then it exists]. For at one time we did not exist, but we were begotten by our fathers, who at one time did not exist either; and so it must be understood from the beginning, back to Adam. But Adam was made from the earth, and at one time earth did not exist. But the earth was made from nothing, since it did not always exist.

But God was always a Father.[315] And whatever he was by nature, so he has begotten the Son. (7) He begot him as an everlasting [Son]—not as a brother to him but begotten of him, his like in nature—Lord of Lord, God of God, very God of very God. And whatever one concludes of the Father, so he must conclude of the Son; whatever he believes of the Son he must < also > hold of the Father. (8) For [the Son] says, "He that believeth not on the Son as he believeth on the Father, and honoreth < not > the Son as he honoreth the Father, the wrath of God abideth on him,"[316] as we find in the Gospel.

And their idea of logic has failed in its turn. (9) For God, who is incomprehensible, has begotten incomprehensible God, before the ages and before time. And there is no interval between Son and Father; in perceiving a Father you simultaneously perceive a Son, and in naming a Son you simultaneously indicate a Father. For Son is perceived from the Father and Father is known from a Son. (10) How can there be Son if he has no Father? And how can there be a Father if he did not beget the Only-begotten? When can the Father not be called "Father," or the Son not be called "Son"—so that people can perceive a Father who was without a

315 Cf. Ath. Or. I C. Ar. 5.
316 Cf. John 3:36; 5:23.

son and later, as though he had managed an improvement, begot a son so that, after the begetting, the Father could be be called Father, with the perfect God who needs no improvement improving in Godhead?

72,1 Since they want to reject this curative drug and health-giving antidote, the foundation of the faith of God's holy church, they make one more pretense and say, "Why the term, 'essence?' Why is the Son called "co-essential" with the Father? Which scripture has spoken of co-essentiality? Which apostle said anything about an 'essence' of God?"

But they do not know that "being" (ὑπόστασις) and "essence" mean the same thing. (2) Christ is Lord in his "being," and "the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his being."[317] Thus he is [the Father's] essence—not an extraneous addition (περιουσία) to it but this existent thing itself (αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ ὄν), as Moses said when he spoke to the children of Israel, "He Who *Is* hath sent me."[318] "He Who Is" is that which is, but that which is is the existent essence. (3) On the other hand, "co-essential" does not mean "one" but by the "co" indicates two perfect entities. Yet the two do not differ from each other, nor are they different from their oneness. But if we have employed an < unscriptural > expression from motives of piety, to pin the truth down—(there can be no refutation whatever of heresy without the confession of the homoousion. (4) As a snake hates the smell of pitch, the exhalation of hartshorn, the odor of lignite and the incense of storax, so do Arius and Sabellius hate the statement of the true confession of the homoousion.) [But even if we have employed such an expression] we shall tell them all the same, (5) "Even though the expression is not in the sacred scriptures—indeed, it is plainly implied in the Law and by the Apostles and the Prophets, for 'By two or three witnesses shall every word be established'[319]—it is still permissible for us to employ a useful expression for piety's sake, to safeguard the holy faith."

72,6 "But what do you mean, you people? Tell us, folks, what are you saying about the Father? Is the Father uncreated?" Of course they'll say yes. Who is so < silly >as to doubt this? What sort of nut would suppose that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is not uncreated? You yourselves must surely admit that he is unbegotten, uncreated, and

317 Heb 1:3.
318 Exod 3:14.
319 Matt 18:16.

unoriginate. For he has no Father before him nor any limit to his years, nor any "beginning of days,"[320] as the scripture says.

72,7 "Thus, if he has no beginning of time or end of time, it is agreed and unquestionable that he is uncreated—but nowhere does scripture say this of him.[321] But even if it is not scriptural we are obliged, for piety's sake, reverently to think and say this of him. (8) In the same way, even if it were not scriptural we would be compelled to speak of "homoousion" in our own language as an abbreviation—even though this might seem beyond us, and the discussion of God might appear to be beyond our powers. (9) But may the Lord himself pardon–not wishing to defend the Godhead which has no need of our support, but we must speak with piety and think with piety, or we perish.

73,1 "Well then, disciples of Arius, give us an answer! We all agree in saying that the Father is unbegotten and uncreated, and the expression is plainly a wonderful one. Where is it in scripture then? Show us the place! The Law has not said it, nor the prophets, nor a Gospel, nor the apostles. Thus if we may use an unscriptural expression with piety, and it is allowable when said for the glory of God, who can accuse us even if the homoousion were not in the scriptures, (2) since we have found a word with which we can confess the certainty of our salvation?" But there are texts [which, confirm the homoousion when] used with the help of pious reasoning, the ones I have listed above[322] and many others. I shall also pass this expression by, however, and with God's help tear open their other expressions and devices to which they have given voice for the entrapment of the innocent.

74,1 The same people say further, along with all the texts which, by bad guesswork, they debase from the Gospel and the Apostle: "As the apostle says next, and as it is found in the Epistle to the Corinthians, in the chapter on resurrection, (2) 'Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered the kingdom to God and his Father, when he shall have put down all rule and authority and power. For he must reign until he hath put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. Now when he saith that all things are in subjection under him, it is

320 Heb 7:3.

321 Cf. Ath. Or. I C. Ar. 34.

322 The only text with which Epiphanius has supported the homoousion is Heb 1:3 (72,2). Holl suggests that some Biblical citations may have fallen out; it must be observed, however, that Epiphanius appears embarrassed by the lack of scriptural support for this doctrine.

manifest that he is excepted that hath put all things in subjection under him. (3) Now when all things are put in subjection under him, then shall the Son himself be subject to him that hath put all things under him, that God may be all in all.' "[323]

74,4 They seize on this passage, and with their customary hostility toward the Only-begotten take his ineffable, glorious Godhead away and say—foolishly, as I have often remarked—"You see that he says, 'Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered the kingdom to God and his Father, when he shall have put down < every rule and > all authority and power. For he must reign, until he hath put all his enemies under his feet.' (5) But 'must,' 'until,' and, 'when he shall deliver the kingdom,' are the setting of a time." And they blasphemously say that these are indications of the cessation and deposition of the one who is reigning < for he remains* > [in power only] until he delivers the kingdom to God and his Father.

74,6 And they do not know the sense of the truth to begin with. Because of the partaking of our flesh and blood by the Only-begotten his human frailties are dwelt on and mentioned in connection with his human nature, in addition to his glory—but not without his ever perfect and glorious Godhead which needs no enhancement of its glory but possesses glorification in itself and is perfection itself. (7) He himself gives an account of the two natures by saying of the more recent one, "Glorify thou me, Father, with the glory that I had with thee before the world was."[324] But when the Father proclaims the glory of the two natures, he says spiritually of the first, "I have glorified it," to show its infinity; but he says, "And I will glorify it again,"[325] of the newer nature because of the incarnation.

75,1 Now for the clarification, even here, of the things the apostle said when he set the truth about Christ down in two ways < and wrote "Son" because of his divine nature* >, and "until he shall deliver the kingdom unto God and his Father" because of his human nature's beginning in time. For the divinity of the Only-begotten was always with the Father—that is, the only-begotten divine Word who has proceeded from the Father without beginning and not in time. (2) Otherwise where is the fulfillment of the angel's words, "The Spirit of the Lord shall come upon thee and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee?"[326] For he said, "Thou

[323] 1 Cor 15:24–28. Cf. Marc. Anc. Inc. 20.
[324] John 17:5.
[325] John 12:28.
[326] Luke 1:35.

shalt bear a son and shalt call his name Jesus"[327] to Mary, to show that the divine Word had descended from on high, had taken flesh in this virgin's womb and perfectly become man. (3) < And > so as not to separate his human perfection from his divine perfection he and told her with the addition of the word, "also," "Therefore *also* that which shall be born of thee shall be called holy, the Son of God."[328]

Then < he says >, "God will give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob unto the ages, and of his kingdom there shall be no end."[329] (4) Now what should those who do not know the life-giving scripture say, given that each of these is the opposite of the other—"He must reign *until [some time]*" and "He shall reign over the house of Jacob *unto the ages*," (and he did not say merely, "unto the age," but, "unto the ages.")? And again, "when he shall have delivered the kingdom unto God and his Father," standing in contrast with "and of his kingdom there shall be no end." And yet both have said such things of the Lord and Christ < and > both are entirely trustworthy—the angel Gabriel is a holy being and the holy apostle inspired—(5) can the scripture, which is always truthful in all things, contradict itself? Never think it!

But as I said at the outset, because of the implications of the manhood Christ possesses all its natural accompaniments. (6) For if he ever hands his rule over to anyone, then he is not ruling now. But if he is not yet ruling, why is it that he is worshiped continually by the angels and archangels, before and during his advent in the flesh, as the scripture says of him, "When he bringeth the first begotten into the world, it saith, angels of God worship him."[330] And again, "He sat down at the right hand of the Father."[331] And again, "Unto him every knee shall bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth."[332]

75,7 Thus he who is worshiped < by > all, always rules. What shall we say then, since the Son who rules always–from the beginning, now and forever—has not yet handed the rule over to the Father? (8) Is the Father excluded from his rule? Never think it! The Son is ruling together with the Father, and the Father with the Son and the Holy Spirit.

---

327 Luke 1:31.
328 Luke 1:35.
329 Luke 1:32.
330 Heb 1:6.
331 Heb 10:12.
332 Phil 2:10.

But what are they saying? "'When he delivereth the kingdom to God and his Father does he himself cease to rule?' " Never think it! (9) Where is the application of, "Of his kingdom there shall be no end."[333] [He shall deliver the kingdom" is said] to show that nothing which has been found or is to be found in the Son opposes or differs from the unity of the Father, and from < the > one will of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. (10) For even here we see that "When he shall have delivered the kingdom to God and his Father, when he shall have put down all rule and authority and power"[334] is said of the Son in the sense of the Son himself delivering the kingdom, and putting down all rule and so on. And "He must reign until he hath put all his enemies under his feet"[335] is said of the Son doing all things, possessing all sovereignty and authority, and with the kingdom delivering his subjects to the Father.

76,1 Then next he again switches to another person, that of the Father in turn, subjecting all things to the Son, and says, "He hath put all things in subjection under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."[336] But he is no longer speaking only in the person of the Father or only in the person of the Son, but right in between the persons of the Father and the Son, and he says, "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."

76,2 "But when *he* saith that all things have been put under him," < and so on >. If I could only ask them in whose person that "He saith" is said! For the profundity of God's mysteries judges the fleshly spiritually. "The fleshly man receiveth not the things of the Spirit, for they are foolishness unto him."[337] (3) For here, if the Father is speaking to the Son, the action is defective; the Son made things subject to the Father. But if "when he saith < that > all things are put in subjection under him" is said in the person of the Son, the thought is unsatisfactory because it assumes futurity in God, either in the Father or in the Son.

76,4 But who is it that is saying that all things have been made subject? For it has not said, "when *they* say"; if it had said, "when they say," it could apply either to the angels or to the subjects. (5) But since it has previously shown the Son subjecting all things and handing them over to the Father, and the Father subjecting all things to the Son, careful exegetes are left

333 Luke 1:33.
334 1 Cor 15:27.
335 1 Cor 15:25.
336 1 Cor 15:25–26.
337 1 Cor 2:14.

with the person of the Holy Spirit. And therefore, after the person of the Father and the person of the Son, the scripture has unequivocally given an intimation of the person of the Holy Spirit who always declares and teaches the truths about the Father and the Son—to keep the full knowledge of the Trinity, and of the additional glory of [Christ's] human nature, from being defectively stated. (6) Then he says, "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." But one who is destroyed has been curbed and can no longer do what he does, or even exist; he has been destroyed.

77,1 Well, what have those who have no knowledge of the scriptures to say about this? "If this is what the text said, we must suppose that the Son will cease to rule."

But [if we say this] we shall commit an impiety and < venture > to rank him with God's subjects, particularly after he ceases to do what he has been doing. (2) Perish the thought! No one who believes and truly hopes in Christ will think of saying or hearing anything unbecoming his glory, as the Arians futilely think that they can. The sacred scripture teaches everything < by saying >, "When he saith, All things are put in subjection under him, it is manifest that he is excepted who hath put all things in subjection under him. But when all things are put in subjection under him, then shall also the Son himself be subject unto him that hath put all things under him."[338]

77,3 This means that the statement that was originally made by the angel, linked [with it] by the similarity of the expression, fittingly and with perfect clarity reveals the statement's whole meaning. The angel said a similar thing, mentioning the Son to begin with and then with an addition which referred to the human nature, showing the union [of the natures]: "Therefore that which is born of thee shall *also* be called holy, the Son of God."[339] (4) For this and similar reasons, "because that which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God," "the Son himself will be subject to him that hath put all things under him" so that Christ's flesh will no longer be fleshly in power but united in [one union with the Godhead], and reign with the Father and Holy Spirit, "of whose kingdom there shall be no end."[340]

77,5 And it is since he has risen that "that God may be all in all"[341] has had its inception, for his flesh has been spiritually united with his one

338 1 Cor 15:27–28.
339 Luke 1:35.
340 Luke 1:33.
341 1 Cor 15:28.

Godhead. But since he says, "Do this in remembrance of me until the coming of the Son of Man,"[342] and "Ye shall see him in like manner as ye have seen him taken up—"[343] then finally, when all things have been fulfilled and nothing left unfulfilled of those things < that are to be > brought back[344] to his Godhead, the prophecy, "that God may be all in all" < will come true* >.

77,6 < But > the text says, < "God," >[345] so that there may be no distinction [between the manhood and the Godhead]. For there is no distinction, to make polytheism impossible, for there is one glory. For the Son is not now out of the Father's control, like a warlord, or under his control like a slave with no freedom of action: [he is] < the One > begotten of the Father, of the same nature and the same Godhead. Nor will he be subject to the Father then from defect or inferiority, or by compulsion or cessation [of rule], (7) but as a true only-begotten Son who rules with the Father forever, and who both elevates the whole creation to a single oneness and honorable reward and teaches this to his holy church, "so that God may be all in all."[346] For there is one Godhead, one sovereignty and one glory of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, with the Father fittingly honored by the Son as a true son, and by the Holy Spirit as not different from the Father and the Son. (8) And let this exclude even the words of those who blaspheme God's Son and Holy Spirit, and the thoughts of their enmity to the Son and the Holy Spirit. And once more we have detected their evil devices and thwarted them.

78,1 Once more they select certain expressions from the Gospel and say, "Why can 'The Son do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do?' "[347] And they do not understand what is said at the beginning [of the scripture]; although it was surely the Father, he did not create something first, and the Son manufacture something afterwards. (2) Which heaven did the Father make all by himself, for the Son to take the example of the first heaven as his model, and manufacture something like it?

But none of the inventors of evil can prove this. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth,"[348] but he says at the same time, in the

342 Cf. 1 Cor 11:25–26.
343 Cf. Acts 1:11.
344 Holl ἀναφέρεσθαι μελλόντων, MSS ἀναφέρειν. We suggest ἀναφέρεσθσϊ <δυναμένων>
345 1 Cor 15:28.
346 1 Cor 15:28.
347 John 5:19.
348 Gen 1:1.

beginning at the creation, "Let us make man in our image and after our likeness."[349] And he didn't say, "Come here and I'll show you how to do it." (3) And then it says, "And God made the man,"[350] and it didn't say, "God made him and showed the Son how to make the man." The Son was no ignoramus, that he needed to learn a trade first and then put it into practice.

78,4 But when our Lord had come in his turn, put on flesh, become man and lived in our midst, he conversed with the Jews who thought that he was abolishing the Father's commandments and, desiring to elevate their minds, so that they would not attend to his manhood alone, said, "The Son doeth naught but that which he seeth the Father do." His intent was to show that the work of the Son is the work of the Father, and that the Father is pleased with the Son's execution of all his work.

78,5 And they will also be harried like this < about > each of the other texts in its turn, when they blunder into them like beasts and are confounded by the lightning flash of the Word, the truth. "Flash thy lightning and scatter them, send forth thine arrows and confound them."[351] (79,1) For we have to deal with the following text, which they select next and quote from the Gospel, "For the Father loveth the Son and showeth him all that he doeth, and greater works than these shall he show him, that ye may marvel";[352] and again, "The Father raiseth the dead and giveth them life. Likewise also doth the Son give life to whom he will";[353] and further, "The Father judgeth no man but hath given all judgment to the Son, that all may honor the Son as they honor the Father."[354] (2) But take note, Arius, at the end of my debate with you, of the conclusion to which the discourse has come. Christ did not say, "that some may say yes and some say no," but, "that *all* may honor the Son as they honor the Father." Stop dishonoring the Son, then, so as not to dishonor the Father! If you choose to ascribe an inferiority in the Son or suppose some defect in him, does the supposition not extend to the Father as well? For it is part of your impudence that you think < meanly > of the Son, and do not honor him as you honor the Father.

---

349 Gen 1:26.
350 Gen 1:27.
351 Ps 143:6.
352 Cf. John 5:20.
353 John 5:21.
354 John 5:22–23.

79,3 Why, indeed, does the Father also give him [this]? Tell me what he says, wonder man! "That the Son may give life to whom he will"—he didn't say, "to whom he is told." There were two particular reasons why the Son needed to receive all this from the Father, though not to be less than the Father. (4) First, it was to direct our minds upward to a single oneness of Godhead, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and not to lower the human reason to divisions and a multiplicity of gods, but to raise it to a single oneness. But second, it was for the transformation of the glory of Christ's human nature and its union with his Godhead.

79,5 For since he came to gladden his disciples with the promise he gave, "There be some standing here that will not taste death till they have seen the Son of Man coming in his glory,"[355] "and on the eighth day,"[356] as the Gospel says—(6) or, as the other says, "after six days."[357] For the evangelists do not say some things in place of others but, although there is one exact truth, it is constantly safeguarded so that people will have no excuse to stumble at the essentials, since "The mind of man is continually bent on evil from his youth."[358] (7) This is the reason why one evangelist said, "on the eighth day." Part of the day on which the Savior said this was left over, and the evangelist counted from that day and hour—if the day was declining, about the ninth hour or the tenth. And again, since the thing was done at about the third or fourth hour of the eighth day, this day was called the eighth. (8) But the other evangelist provides a safeguard and says, "after six days." He did not count on the day when the Savior said the word to the disciples, or the day on which he did the work, but the six full days in between.

80,1 But since I have come to the discussion of the saying, I shall give the explanation. "He took Peter and James and John and brought them into the mount, and was transfigured, and his countenance shone as the sun"—his countenance in the flesh united with his Godhead—and "his raiment shone white as snow."[359] Plainly, this means the flesh taken from Mary, which was of our stock. (2) And it was changed to glory, the added glory of the Godhead, the honor, perfection and heavenly glory which his flesh did not have at the beginning, but which it < was > receiving here in its union with the divine Word.

---

355 Matt 16:28.
356 Luke 9:28.
357 Matt 17:1.
358 Gen 8:21.
359 Cf. Matt 17:1–2.

80,3 In this way understand the words we quoted earlier, "He hath given all judgment to the Son"[360]—because he has given him authority "to give life to whom he will"—[361] as proof, first of all, of the unity of the divine nature, and of its one will which ascribes the whole of goodness to the Father and to one First Principle and Godhead. For there are three perfect entities but one Godhead, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit; and in its turn the human nature [of Christ] which, along with the divine nature, receives the gift, authority and perfection of rank which is granted it by the Father and the Son, and which < has been united > in a single spiritual oneness of Godhead.

81,1 And we have barely managed to get past this stormy place and through this whole attack by savage beasts—the wild heaving of the billows and the fearful foaming of the seas. Because, in my inadequacy, I received the power and the grace from God, I have burned my opponents' spears and shields thanks to the right reasoning in my mind, have broken the bows of the opposition, < and have been victorious* > over this serpent, the many-headed ugliness of the hydra, (2) so that I can sing < the > song of triumph in God, "Let us sing to the Lord, for he is gloriously magnified; horse and rider hath he hurled into the sea."[362]

I have broken the dragon's head above "the water that goes softly," of which these present day fellow heirs with the Jews would have no part. The prophet had them in mind when he said, (3) "Because ye refuse the water of Siloam that goeth softly, and prefer to have the king Rezin and Tabeel the son of Remaliah, behold, the Lord bringeth upon you the mighty water of the river, the king of Assyria,"[363] and so on. (4) But we have received help in the Lord, the "saliva spat on the ground" by his true flesh, and with the spittle have received "the clay" smeared "on our eyes,"[364] so that we who were once in ignorance now know the truth, and have gone and washed in "Siloam," which means "the Sent."[365] That is, [we have washed] in his human nature and perfect Godhead, and since we now see we no longer deny the Lord, even though the partisans of Arius and successors of the Jews cast us out of the synagogue. (5) For like the Jews, the Arians have agreed that whoever confesses the Lord must "be cast out of the

360 John 5:22.
361 John 5:21.
362 Exod 15:1.
363 Isa 8:6–7.
364 Cf. John 9:6.
365 Cf. John 9:7.

synagogue,"[366] showing that one who has recovered his sight is a reproach to those who cannot see. For if their synagogue were not all blind, they would not eject someone whose eyes had been opened.

81,6 Let us thank the Lord, then, that we have recovered our sight and confess the Lord and, if we perform the work of the commandments, have healed our hurts; and that we have trod upon the serpent and broken the head of the dragon by the power of God, to whom be glory, honor and might, the Father in the Son, and the Son in the Father with the Holy Spirit, unto the ages of ages. Amen.

81,7 But leaving this hydra we have slain, with its seven heads and many segments, let us go on to the rest as usual, beloved, calling on God, our constant help, to take the same care of us and of any who desire to read this work, for the cure of those who have been bitten, and the correction of those who have already joined the ranks of the evil.

[366] Cf. John 9:22.

ANACEPHALAEOSIS VI

Here too are the contents of Section One of Volume Three, Section Six in our previously mentioned system of numeration. It contains seven Sects together with the Schisms, as follows:

70. A rebellion and schism, but not sect, of Audians. They are orderly in their behavior and way of living, hold the faith exactly as the catholic church does, and most of them live in monasteries. But they make an immoderate use of a number of apocryphal works. They do not pray with us because they find fault with our bishops, and call [some of] < them > "rich" and others, other things. They keep the Passover separately from the rest of us, on the Jewish date. Besides they have some ignorant, contentious ideas and interpret our creation in God's image with extreme literalness.

71. Photinians. Photinus of Sirmium, who is still alive and to this day has been wandering around; he held the same beliefs as Paul the Samosatian. They are somewhat different from Paul but they too maintain that Christ's existence dates from Mary.

72. Marcellians, < who > derive from Marcellus of Ancyra in Galatia. Originally he was rumored to have views very close to Sabellius. And although he often appeared in his own defense, and explained himself in writing, he was accused by many of persisting in the same beliefs. But he has probably repented and corrected his errors, he perhaps, or his disciples. For some orthodox authorities have more or less defended him and his disciples.

73. Semi-Arians, who confess Christ as a creature, but deceptively say that he is not a creature like any other. "We call him 'the Son,' " they say, "but to avoid attributing suffering to the Father as the result of begetting, we say he is a creature." They similarly state categorically of the Holy Spirit that he likewise is a creature, and they reject the Son's homoousion but prefer to say "homoeousion." Others of them, however, have rejected the homoeousion as well.

74. Pneumatomachi. These have proper views of Christ, but blaspheme the Holy Spirit by defining him as a creature and not of the Godhead but rather, illegitimately, as something created for an operation, and they say that he is only a sanctifying power.

75. Aerians. Aerius was from Pontus; he still survives as a trial to the world. He was a presbyter of the bishop Eustathius who was slanderously accused of Arianism. And because Aerius was not made bishop himself he

taught many doctrines contrary to those of the church and was a complete Arian in faith but carried it further. He says we must not make offerings for those who have fallen asleep before us, and forbids fasting on Wednesday and Friday, and in Lent and Paschal time. He preaches renunciation but eats all sorts of meat and delicacies without hesitation. But he says that if one of his followers should wish to fast, this should not be on set days but when he wants to, "for you are not under the Law." He says that a bishop is no different from a presbyter.

76. Aetians derive from Aetius of Cilicia, who was made a deacon by George, the Arian bishop of Alexandria. They are also called Anomoeans, but some call them Eunomians from one Eunomius, a disciple of Aetius who is still alive. Also allied with them was the Arianizer Eudoxius, but he separated himself from them supposedly for fear of the emperor Constantius, and only Aetius was exiled. Eudoxius continued to be an Arianizer, but not like Aetius.

These Anomoeans, or Aetians, separate Christ and the Holy Spirit from God altogether, maintain that he is a creature, and deny that he has even a likeness to God. For they like to give proofs of God with Aristotelian and geometrical syllogisms, and by such methods < determine >, if you please, that Christ cannot be of God.

The ones named Eunomians after Eunomius rebaptize all who come to them, not only [catholics] but < those who come > from the Arians as well. But they turn their candidates upside down to baptize them, or so it is widely reported. And they say that if one errs through fornication or another sin it does not matter; God requires only that one be in none other than this faith which they hold.

These, too, are the seven sects of Section One of Volume Three, which is Section Six of the series.

On the Schism of the Audians.[1] *50, but 70 of the Series*

1,1 Audians, or Odians, are a body < of laity* >. They have withdrawn from the world and reside in monasteries—in deserts and, nearer the cities,

[1] Audius is discussed at Theodore bar Khōni, Pognon pp. 194–196; Theod. H. E. 4.10.1; Haer. Fab. 4.10. Bar Khouni identifies Audius as the archdeacon of the church in Edessa. The Audians were on Cyprus for a time, and Epiphanius would have had ample opportunity for contact with them. 1,5 and 6,2 contain quotations from Audian sources, and at 8,11 Epiphanius says specifically that he has been quoting them. It is uncertain, however, whether he is using an Audian written source, or retailing scraps of conversation and debate.

in suburbs, and wherever they have their residences, or "folds." Audius became their founder in Arius' time, when the council of those who deposed him was convened against Arius.

1,2 Audius was from Mesopotamia and a man eminent in his homeland for the purity of his life, godly zeal, and faith. And often, when he saw the things that went on in the churches under the noses of the bishops and presbyters, he would oppose such behavior, saying in reproof, "This is not the way it should be; these things ought not to be so done"—like a truth-teller, and as befits persons who speak openly from regard for the truth, particularly when their own lives are exemplary.

1,3 And so, as I said, when he saw such things in the churches he felt compelled to speak in reproof of them, and would not keep quiet. For if he saw a money-loving member of the clergy—a bishop, or presbyter, or any other cleric—he was sure to speak out. And if he saw one < living > in luxury and wantonness, or someone debasing the church's message and ordinance, he could not abide it, and, as I said, would accuse him. (4) And to those whose lives were not up to standard, this was burdensome.

He was insulted and contradicted for this, was hated, and lived a stormy life of rejection and dishonor. For some time he was in good standing in the churches until certain persons, in extreme annoyance, expelled him for this reason. He would not consent to this, however, but persisted in speaking the truth and in not withdrawing from the bond of the one unity of the holy catholic church.

1,5 But because he was subjected to beatings, and his companions with him, and often very ill-used, he most reluctantly took account of the wretchedness of his mistreatment. For he separated himself from the church and many rebelled with him, and this is the way he caused the division, with no divergence at all from the faith but entire orthodoxy on his part and his companions'—even though one must certainly say that he and his aderents are contentious in a certain small point.

2,1 Besides his admirable confession of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit in the sense of the catholic church, and his completely orthodox observance of the rest, his whole manner of life < was > admirable. (2) For he earned his living with his own hands, and so did the bishops under him, and the presbyters and all the rest. (He was consecrated bishop later, after his expulsion from the church, by another bishop who had the same complaint and had withdrawn from the church.) (3) < But > as to what I started to say—since I have gotten sidetracked I shall take up the thread again and tell the whole story—I mean about the expression from the sacred scriptures which he harps on, as though to be as

stubborn, ignorant and contentious as possible. (4) For he and his adherents stubbornly declare that the gift God granted Adam of being in his image applies to his body,[2] supposedly because of the literal wording of "Let us make man in our image and after our likeness."[3] And then the word of God adds, "And God took dust of the earth and made man."[4] (5) "Since scripture has said < that God made > man from the earth," says Audius, "see how it has said with perfect truth that the entire earthy part is 'man.' Therefore it said earlier that the earthy part of man will itself be in the image of God."

And this is stubborn, as I said, and ignorant—this deciding in which part of man, if there is any need to say, "part," God's image is located—because of the many conflicting ideas of this text which occur to people, occasioning a number of disputes. (6) If being "in the image of God" applies literally, and not figuratively, to the body, we shall either make God visible and corporeal by saying this, or else make man God's equal. (7) We should therefore never declare or affirm with confidence which part of man is "in God's image," but, not to make light of God's grace and disbelieve God, we should confess that God's image is in man.

For whatever God says is true, even though, in a few instances, it has eluded our understanding. (8) To deny this doctrine of God's image is not faithful, or true to God's holy church. All people are plainly in God's image and no one whose hope is in God will deny it, unless certain persons, who are expelled from the church and the tradition of the patriarchs, prophets, Law, apostles and evangelists, make up their own mythology.

3,1 And thus, with their quite contentious position on this point, the Audians too depart from the church's form of the tradition, which believes that everyone is in God's image but < makes > no < attempt > to define where in man the image is located. For neither those who discuss this in mythological terms, nor those who deny it, can prove their point.[5] (2) For some say that "in the image" applies to the soul, from a belief that only physical things are susceptible to reasoning. And people like this do not know that the soul can be reasoned about—if we must attend to syllogisms

[2] Cf. Theod. H. E. 4.10.2; Haer. Fab. 4.10; Theodore bar Khouni, Pognon p. 195.

[3] Gen 1:26.

[4] Gen 1:27. Cf. Gen. 2:7. Chrysostom argues against an anthropomorphic interpretation of these texts at In Gen. Sermo 2.2., PG 54, 589.

[5] The discussion which follows is anti-Origenist. Cf. Anc. 55,4; Epiphanius/John of Jerusalem = Jer. Ep. 51.7.

and not just rely on God with simple minds and believe that what God has said is truth, but is known only to one who knows the whole truth.

3,3 Others, though, say in turn that "in the image" applies neither to the soul nor to the body, but means virtue. But others say that it is not virtue but baptism and the gift conferred in baptism, supposedly from the literal wording of "As we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly."[6] Others, again, disagree (4) but prefer to say that the image of God was in Adam until he fell into transgression, ate of the tree, and was expelled. But from the time of his expulsion he lost the image. (5) And people do make up a lot of stories! We must not "give place" to them "even for an hour"[7]—to the one group or the other, to those who say this, or those who say that—but believe that the image of God is in man, but that, first and foremost, it is in the whole man and not just < in one part >. But where this image is, or to which part of man "in the image" applies, is known only to the God who has graciously granted man the image.

3,6 For man has not lost the image of God, unless he has debased the image by sullying himself with unimportant matters and pernicious sins. See here, God says to Noah after Adam's time, "Lo, I have given thee all things as herbs of the field. Slay and eat, but eat not flesh with the life-blood, for I shall require your lives. Everyone that sheddeth a man's blood upon the earth, for the blood of that man his own blood shall be required, for in the image of God have I made man, and I will require your blood from everyone that sheddeth it upon the face of the earth."[8] (7) And do you see that God's image is said to be in man ten generations after the creation of Adam?

David too, much later, says < in > the Holy Spirit, "All is vanity, every man that liveth; < and yet man goeth on in the image. >"[9] Moreover, the apostle after him says, "A man ought not to have long hair, for he is the image and glory of God."[10] (8) Moreover James after him says that 'The tongue is an unruly evil, full of deadly poison. Therewith we bless our God and Father, and therewith curse we men, which are made in the image of God. My brethren, these things ought not so to be."[11] And see

---

6 1 Cor 15:49.
7 Gal 2:5.
8 Cf. Gen 9:3–6.
9 Ps 38:6–7.
10 1 Cor 11:7.
11 James 3:8–10.

how the argument of those who say that Adam lost the image of God has come to nothing.

4,1 But again, the argument and explanation of the people who say that "in the image" means the soul, goes something like this. The soul is invisible as God is invisible. It is active, a mover, intelligent, rational—and for this reason it is the image of God, since it mimics God on earth by moving, acting and doing all the other things that man does rationally. (2) But they too can be out-argued. If these are the reasons why the soul is said to be in the image of God, it cannot be in his image. God is more than ten thousand times, and still more incomprehensible and inconceivable than the soul, knowing all things past and present, visible and invisible, the ends of the earth and the pillars of the abyss, the heights of heaven and all that is, himself containing all things but contained by none. (3) The soul, however, is contained in a body, does not know the pillars of the abyss, has no knowledge of the breadth of the earth, is unacquainted with the ends of the world, does not comprehend the heights of heaven, < and does not know* > all that will be, or when it, and all that has come to be before it, comes to be. And there is a great deal to say about it and about things of its sort, and besides, the soul has divisions, while God is indivisible. (4) The apostle says, "For the word of God is living, and quick, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and marrow, and is a discerner of thoughts and intents. And no creature is not manifest in his sight,"[12] and so on. And you see that their argument [here] has also failed.

5,1 And the argument of those who say that the body is in God's image has failed in its turn. How can the visible be like the invisible? How can the corporeal be like the incorporeal? How can the tangible be like the incomprehensible? (2) We see in front of us with the eyes we have, but do not know what is behind us. But in God there is no vicissitude, no defect, never think it! He is altogether light, altogether eye, altogether glory; for God is spirit, and spirit above spirit, and light above every light. For all that he has made is inferior to his glory; only the Trinity exists in incomprehensibility, and in incomparable, unfathomable glory.

5,3 And as to the argument of those who say, in turn, that virtue is the image—there can be no virtue without the observance of the commandments, but many people differ from each other in virtue. For there are many kinds of virtue. I myself know some who are confessors, who have

[12] Heb 4:12–13.

given their bodies and souls for their Master in the confession of him; who have persevered in purity and held the truest faith; who are outstanding in godliness, kindliness and piety and have persevered in fasting, and in every kind of goodness and the marks of virtue. (4) But they happen to have some failing—< they are > abusive, swear by God's name, are story-tellers or irritable, lead a life < covetous* > of gold, silver and the rest—all things which lessen the measure of virtue. What shall we say? Did they acquire God's image because of their virtue, but suddenly < lose* > God's image because of a few human failings, < so that* > the image of God < is incomplete* >, and the image in them is no longer full? And again, their argument has failed.

5,5 Once more, there is a great deal wrong with the argument of those who say that baptism is < the > image of God. Abraham did not have baptism—or Isaac, Jacob, Elijah, Moses, or Noah and Enoch before them, or the prophets, Isaiah and the rest. Well? Don't they have the image? And there is much to say in reply < to > these people, as there is < to > the Audians with their contentious location of the image of God in the body.

6,1 But the Audians cite certain other texts as well. They say, "'The eyes of the Lord look upon the poor, and his ears are open unto their prayer,[13] and, 'The hand of the Lord hath made all these,'[14] and, 'Hath not my hand made all these, O stiff-necked people?'[15] (2) and, 'Heaven is my throne and the earth is my footstool,'[16] and whatever else of the kind that scripture says of God. 'I saw the Lord of hosts seated upon a throne high and lifted up';[17] His head was white as wool and his garment white as snow.'[18] And do you see," they say, "how the body is in the image of God?" And even in this they are refractory, and press the text, "The Lord appeared to the prophets"[19] farther than it is in man's power to do.

6,3 Of course the Lord appeared as he chose since he is mighty in all things, and we do not deny that the prophets saw God—and not only the prophets, but the apostles as well. St. Stephen the Protomartyr says, "Behold, I see heaven open, and the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God and the Father."[20]

---

[13] Ps 10:4; 33:16.
[14] Isa 41:20.
[15] Isa 66:1.
[16] Isa 66:1.
[17] Isa 6:1.
[18] Cf. Dan 7:9.
[19] This citation is not scriptural.
[20] Acts 7:2.

6,4 But in his kindness to his creation God the all-good [reveals himself] by his power, so that no unbeliever may suppose that what is said of God is mere words and not fact, that what is said of God stops with speech, and that the apostle's "He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that love him,"[21] is not so. (5) To hearten the man he has formed God reveals himself to his holy and worthy ones, so that they may actually see God, be secure in their minds, hope in truth, truly proclaim him, and assure the faithful, (6) "Of course the pagans' beliefs about God are nothing but words and imagination. But we really know God, the true and truly existent king, the incomprehensible, the maker of all, one God—and the only-begotten God who is begotten of him and in no way different from the Father; and his Holy Spirit, who differs in no way from the Father and the Son"—as I have said at length, in every Sect, about the godly faith.

7,1 And that God has appeared to men I have often said and do not deny. For if we deny the sacred scriptures we are not truthful, but guilty of abandoning the truth—or, if we reject the Old Testament, we are no longer members of the catholic church.

7,2 But the Gospel has said, "No man hath seen God at any time, let the only-begotten God himself declare him."[22] On the other hand, the same sacred scripture < says >, "God appeared to Abraham when he was in Mesopotamia."[23] And the Lord himself says in the Gospel, "Their angels behold the face of my Father which is in heaven."[24]

7,3 But someone will be sure to say the sacred scripture means that the prophets saw God in their minds, because of the text, "Even their angels behold the face of my Father which is in heaven," and again, "Blessed are the pure *in heart*, for they shall see God."[25] (4) If < someone > has noticed this and put texts together to fit his own conception, < he > might say that each prophet sees God in his mind, for he does not do it with his eyes.

7,5 But the sacred scripture contradicts this by saying through Isaiah the prophet, "Woe is me, for I am stunned, for I, a man of unclean lips, dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips, and with mine eyes I have seen the Lord of hosts."[26] And he didn't say with his mind or in

---

21 Heb 11:6.
22 Cf. John 1:18.
23 Acts 7:2.
24 Matt 18:10.
25 Matt 5:8.
26 Isa 6:1.

his thoughts but with his eyes, confirming the truths and certainties of the faith.

7,6 What can we say, then, when the Gospel says that no one has ever seen God, while the prophets and apostles, and the Lord himself, say that they have? Is there any contradiction in the sacred scripture? Never! (7) Prophets and apostles did see God, and this is true. But they saw him as they were able and as it was possible for them, and God appeared to them as he willed, "for with him all things are possible."[27] That God is invisible and incomprehensible, this is plain and universally agreed; but on the other hand, he is able to do what he wills, "For none can resist his will."[28] By his nature, then, he is invisible, and in his glory he is incomprehensible; (8) but if he chooses to appear to the man he has made, there is nothing to oppose his will. For the Godhead has no frailties to prevent its doing what it wills or make it do what it does not will; it has the power to do what it wills. But it does what befits the Godhead, for there is nothing whatever to oppose God's will so that he cannot do what he wills in keeping with his Godhead. (9) And first and foremost, it is not possible for a human being to see God, and the visible is not competent to see the invisible. But the invisible God has accomplished the impossible by his loving kindness and power, and by his might has rendered some worthy of seeing the invisible. And the person who < saw > him saw the invisible and infinite, not as the infinite was, but as the nature of one who had no power to see him could bear when empowered to the fullest. And there can be no discrepancy in the sacred scripture, nor will text will be found in contradiction to text.

8,1 To give an example I have often used, it is as though one saw the sky through a very small opening and said, "I see the sky," and such a man would not be lying; he really does see the sky. But someone might wisely tell him, "You haven't seen the sky," and he would not be lying. (2) The person who says he has seen the sky isn't lying, and the person who tells him he hasn't is also telling the truth. For the man didn't see its extent or its breadth. And the person who had seen it told the truth, but the one who replied that he hadn't did not lie, but also told the truth.

8,3 Besides, we often stand on a mountain top and behold the sea, and if we say we have seen the sea, we haven't lied. But if someone replies, "You haven't seen it," he isn't lying either. Where its full breadth reaches to, its full length, its depth, where the innermost chambers of the deep

[27] Matt 19:26.
[28] Cf. Rom 9:19.

are and the furthest bounds of the deep, < no > human being can know. (4) Now if our knowledge of created things is so limited, how much more with the grace God has granted the prophets and apostles? They truly saw God, and yet did not see him. They saw him as far as their natures could bear, and that by the grace of the power with which, from love of the man who is his, He who is mighty in all things has endowed his true servants.

8,5 So if Audians think that God has hands for this reason, or eyes or the rest, because he so appeared to the prophets and apostles, they are behaving contentiously but are confuted by the truth. (6) Of all that God says in the sacred scripture, we must believe that it is; but how it is, is known to him alone. And that he really appeared—yes, but he appeared as he willed to, and truly looked as he appeared. For God can do all things, and nothing is impossible for him. But, being unfathomable spirit, he is incomprehensible, containing all things but himself contained by none. (7) And as is the Father, so is the Son, and so is the Holy Spirit in Godhead. But only the Only-begotten came and assumed the flesh in which he also rose, which he also united with his Godhead joining it to spirit, < and > [in which] he sat down in glory at the Father's right hand as the scripture says. (8) And since he is incomprehensible and unfathomable, all that is said of him is really true. And since God is incomprehensible all that is said of him is sure, but there is no comprehending God's attributes, and how he exists in incomprehensible glory.

8,9 And with my human lips I have said these things in praise of God as I was able. For even though I have further ideas about God in my mind I do not have the use of a tongue other than the one God has meted out to me. But all that is in the mind the mouth cannot say since it is closed by its measure and hemmed in by the organs of the body. (10) And so God pardons me and accepts my knowledge of him, and the praise that is beyond my power to give. < Not that I desire > to give God anything, but I desire to glorify the Godhead as best I can, so as to hold godly beliefs, and not be deprived of his grace and truth.

8,11 In singling out these points about Audius and the Audians I have reported the things they say, which they inappropriately affirm by expounding them themselves in an eccentric way, and by contentiously persisting in them. (9,1) But they have certain other positions besides, on which they take a particularly strong stand and have aggravated the division of the church, and with which they frighten others, often detach them from the church, and have attracted men and women. (2) For they choose to celebrate the Passover with the Jews—that is, they contentiously celebrate the Passover at the same time that the Jews are holding

their Festival of Unleavened Bread. And indeed, < it is true > that this used to be the church's custom—even though they tell churchmen a slanderous thing in this regard and say, (3) "You abandoned the fathers' Paschal rite in Constantine's time from deference to the emperor, and changed the day to suit the emperor." (4) And some, again, declare with a contentiousness of their own, "You changed the Passover to Constantine's birthday."[29]

9,5 And if the Paschal Feast were celebrated on the same day each year, and it had been decided to keep it on that day at the council convoked by Constantine, what they say might be plausible. But since the rite cannot be held on the same date each year, their argument is worthless. The emperor was not concerned for his birthday, but for the unity of the church. (6) In fact God accomplished two very important things through Constantine, the most beloved of God and forever the most blessed. [One was] the gathering of an ecumenical council and the publication of the creed that was issued at Nicaea and confessed < by > the assembled bishops with their signatures—the deposition of Arius, and the declaration to all of the purity of the faith. [The other was] their rectification of the Paschal Feast for the sake of our unity.

9,7 For long ago, even from the earliest days, its various celebrations in the church differed, occasioning ridicule every year, with some keeping it a week early and quarreling with the others, others a week late—some celebrating it in advance, some in between, others afterwards. (8) And in a word, as is not unknown to many scholarly persons, there was a lot of muddle and tiresomeness every time a controversy was aroused in the church's teaching about this festival—as in the time of Polycarp and Victor the east was at odds with the west and they would not accept letters of commendation from each other.[30] (9) But in as many other times—as in the time of Alexander, the bishop of Alexandria, and Criscentius,[31] when each is found writing to the other and quarreling, and down to our own day. This has been the situation ever since < the church > was thrown into disorder after the time of the circumcised bishops.[32] And so < bishops >,

[29] Holl III, p. 241: "Die Vicennalia Konstantins sind am 25. Juli 325 *(natalis purpurae)* gefeiert: die Audianer meinen, man habe dem Kaiser die Einigung über den Ostertermin als Geburtstagsgeschenk dargebracht; Epiphanius missversteht das."

[30] Epiphanius may have learned of the controversy between Polycarp and Victor from Eus. H. E. 5.24.1–11.

[31] Criscentius is mentioned on p. 7 of the Chronicon Paschale (Dindorf).

[32] The first fifteen bishops of Jerusalem. Cf. Eus. H. E. 4.4.5.

gathering then from every quarter and making a precise investigation, determined that the festival be celebrated with one accord, as befits its date and rite.

10,1 But on this point the Audians cite the Ordinance of the Apostles, which is held to be dubious by many but is not spurious. For it contains every canonical regulation and no falsification of the faith < is to be found > there—of its confession, or of the church's order, law and creed. (2) But the line which they seriously misinterpret, and ignorantly misunderstand in taking < their cue > for the Paschal Feast from it, is < the following >. The apostles decree in the Ordinance, "Reckon ye not, but celebrate when your brethren of the circumcision do; celebrate with them."[33] And they did not say, "your brethren *in* the circumcision," but, "your brethren *of* the circumcision," to show that those who had come from the circumcision to the church were the leaders from then on, and so that the others would agree < with them >, and one not celebrate the Paschal Feast at one time, and another at another. (3) For they came to this conclusion entirely for the sake of the [church's] unity.

But the Audians were not aware of the apostles' intent and the intent of the passage in the Ordinance, and thought that the Paschal Feast should be celebrated with the Jews. (4) And there were altogether fifteen bishops from the circumcision.[34] And at that time, when the circumcised bishops were consecrated at Jerusalem, it was essential that the whole world follow and celebrate with them, so that there would be one concord and agreement, the celebration of one festival. (5) Hence their their concern [was] to bring people's minds into accord for the unity of the church.

< But* > since < the festival* > could not be celebrated < in this way* > for such a long time, by God's good pleasure < a correction > was made for harmony's sake was made in the time of Constantine. (6) For the words of the apostles are quoted here for the sake of harmony, as they testify by saying, "Even if they are in error, let it not concern you."[35] But from the very words that are said there, the contradiction will be evident. For they say that the vigil should be held midway through the Days of Unleavened

---

[33] The Didascalia in its present form does not contain this line, but Schwartz and others argue (pp. 104–121) that the Didascalia is a much edited and reedited lawbook; the quotation may have stood in the version known to the Audians and Epiphanius. In fact the version of the Didascalia now extant ties the Easter celebration to the Jewish Paschal Feast, in that it directs Christians to begin their fast of Holy Week on the day of the Jewish Paschal Feast, Didascalia 21, S-S p. 218; A-F p. 110.

[34] Cf. Eus. H. E. 4.5.3.

[35] This is connected with the quotation above. Cf. the preceding note.

Bread.[36] But by the church's dating [of the Paschal Feast] this cannot always be done.

11,1 For the fixing of the date of the Paschal Feast is determined by three factors: from the course of the sun; because of the Lord's Day; and because of the lunar month which is found in the Law, so that the Passover may be slain on the fourteenth of the month as the Law says. (2) Thus[37] it cannot be celebrated unless the day of the equinox is past, although the Jews do not observe this or care to keep so important a matter precise; with them, everything is worthless and erroneous.[38] Still, even though such precision is required in so important a question, the apostles' declaration was not made for the sake of this question and for precision, but in the interest of concord. And < if >, as the Audians insist, the apostles' ordinance was that we celebrate with the enemies of Christ, how much more must we celebrate with the church for the sake of concord, so as not to mar the harmony of the church?

11,3 Now how can this (i.e., celebrating on the Jewish date) be done? The same apostles say, "When they feast, mourn ye for them with fasting, for they crucified Christ on the day of the feast. And when they mourn on the Day of Unleavened Bread and eat with bitter herbs, then feast ye."[39] (4) But it sometimes happens that they take the bitter herbs on the Lord's Day. For they can slay the Passover at evening at the dawning of the Lord's Day. For they cannot do [this] work after the evening [just after] the Sabbath is over. Very well, if they wake up feasting after slaughtering [the lamb], how can we mourn and weep on the Lord's Day since, again, the apostles tell us in the Ordinance, "Whoso afflicteth his soul on the Lord's Day is under God's curse."[40]

11,5 And do you see how much scruple and contradiction there is when the thing cannot be done as directed? But the whole truth lies in the purpose of their teaching, and from the apostles' Ordinance itself < it

---

[36] "Ihr sollt eifrig sein, um ihre Wachen zu erfüllen mitten im Fest ihrer ungesäuerten," Didascalia 21, S-S p. 222; A-F p. 114.

[37] Because the course of the sun, as well as the course of the moon, must be taken into account.

[38] Cf. Didascalia 21, "the error and the destruction of the people," S-S p. 216; A-F p. 111. This is supplementary evidence that Epiphanius was familiar with some form of the Didascalia.

[39] This is not in the version of the Didascalia now extant. But cf. Didascalia 21, A-F p. 114: "Ihr müsst also fasten, wenn jenes Volk das Pasach feiert, und eifrig sein, ihre Wachen zu erfüllen mitten in ihrer ungesäuerten." Cf. S-S p. 222.

[40] Didascalia 21, A-F p. 114, "Am Sonntag aber sollt ihr allezeit guter Dinge sein, denn der macht sich einer Sünde schuldig, der am Sonntag sich selbst quält." Cf. S-S p. 222.

is plain > how the fixing of the reckoning was arrived at for the sake of concord. < For > if we < always > celebrate when the Jews do, < we shall sometimes celebrate > after the equinox, as they often do, and we too; and again, we shall sometimes celebrate before the equinox, as they do when they celebrate alone.[41] (6) Therefore if we celebrate [then] too, we may keep two Paschal Feasts in one year, [one] after the equinox and [one] before it; but the next year we shall not keep any Paschal Feast at all, and the whole thing will turn out to be error rather than of truth. For the year will not be over before the day of the equinox; and the cycle[42] of the course [of the sun], which God has given men, is not complete unless the equinox is past.

12,1 And much could be said about the good the fathers did—or rather, the good God did through them—by arriving at the absolutely correct determination, for the church, of this all-venerable, all-holy Paschal Feast, its celebration after the equinox, which is the day on which the date of the fourteenth of the lunar month falls. Not that we are to keep it on the fourteenth itself; the Jews require one day, while we require not one day but six, a full week. (2) The Law itself says, to extend the time, "Ye shall take for yourselves a lamb of a year old, without blemish, perfect, on the tenth of the month, and ye shall keep it until the fourteenth, and ye shall slay it near evening on the fourteenth day of the month,"[43] that is, the lunar. But the church observes the Paschal festival, (3) that is, the week which is designated even by the apostles themselves in the Ordinance, beginning with the second day of the week, the purchase of the lamb. And the lamb is publicly slaughtered (i.e., by the Jews) if the fourteenth of the month falls on the second day of the week—or if it falls on the third, the fourth, the fifth, the eve of the Sabbath, or the Sabbath; for the six days are designated for this purpose.[44]

12,4 For neither can we < end > the Paschal Feast when the sixteenth of the month begins, or begin the so-called holy week of dry fare and Paschal Feast on the ninth, but [must keep] between the tenth and the night before the fifteenth, in between the two courses of night and day. (5) And though their reckoning, of the fourteen days of the lunar month, is included [in ours]—even though it barely reaches to daybreak on the fifteenth because of our necessarily exact calculation of the course of the

[41] I.e., when the Christians cannot observe the same day.
[42] Holl περίμετρος, MSS ἐνιαυτός.
[43] Exod 12:3; 5; 6.
[44] Epiphanius' point is that the Jews really keep a week themselves, as the Christians do.

sun after the equinox, the course of the moon because of the fourteenth, and the full week because of the Lord's Day—[still], we also < observe* > the calculation on the tenth day, which is the taking of the lamb and the initial letter of the name of Jesus. For his antitype, a lamb, was taken in this name, and so is set on the tenth.

But we cannot have the beginning or end [of the festival] at the beginning of the sixteenth of the month, or on the ninth. (6) For by growing progressively shorter[45] because of the difference between the courses of the sun and the moon the [lunar] years cause the following inequality, though this is not meant to be a divinely ordained stumbling block. For this exact computation has been set by God in his all-wise governance, which he has granted his world by appointing, of his loving kindness, the bounds of the luminaries, seasons, months, years and solstices, through his providential care for humankind.

13,1 For though the solar year is completed in 365 days and three hours, there is still a shortage of eleven days, three hours in the course of the moon, since the moon completes its year in 354 days. (2) And the first year has eleven intercalary days, so called, and three hours, the second has twenty-two days and six hours, and the third has thirty-three days and nine hours. This makes one intercalary month, as it is called.

13,3 For the thirty days are intercalated, but three days and nine hours are left over. Added to the eleven days and three hours of the fourth year, these make fourteen days and twelve hours. And when another eleven days and three hours are added, the total is twenty-five days and fifteen hours. And in the sixth year, since another eleven days and three hours are added to the year, there is a total of thirty-six days and eighteen hours, which make one intercalary month. And two months have been intercalated, and (one) every three years. (4) There is one month in the first three years, and another month in the other three.

And six days, plus eighteen hours, are left over from the intercalary days. When these are added, in the seventh year, to the eleven days and three hours of that year, the total is seventeen days and twenty-one hours. And when the eleven days and three hours are again added on the eighth year, this becomes twenty-eight intercalated days—and twenty-four hours, which make two days. (5) The sum of these hours added to the twenty-eight days is thirty. And so the thirty days < are intercalated > in

[45] ἀνθυπερβάτως ὑστεροῦντες, literally, "by retrogressive deficiency." I.e., because of the greater length of the solar year, the end of the lunar year moves farther back, each year, toward the beginning of the solar year, unless this is corrected by intercalation.

the eighth year, the one month in two years. (6) And thus ninety days < are intercalated > over a period of eight years These are a total of three intercalary months, which come one month every three years, and later one month in two. The paschal festival differs among Jews, Christians and the others, in these three intercalations of the groups of days.

14,1 Here is where the Audians differ; and they deceive men and women in this regard with their parade of keeping the original tradition and following the Ordinance of the Apostles. But they ignore any exact calculation and are not clear about the apostles' charge in the Ordinance—which was by no means to hold the observance exactly < like > the Jews, but to eliminate the contentiousness of those who each wanted to celebrate in their own way, and not in harmony. (2) For Christ desires one Paschal Feast, reckons this [one a Paschal Feast], and accepts a person who keeps it without contention but with those whose observance is exact, [that is], all the holy church which keeps the festival in many places. (3) And if the Paschal Feast had been fragmented after Constantine, the slanderers would have a point. But since the divisions came before Constantine and ridicule arose, with the pagans talking about the disharmony in the church and making fun of it—but by the zeal of the bishops the division was united in one harmony in Constantine's time—(4) what can be more important and acceptable than to reconcile a people to God from [all] the ends of the earth on one day? [What better] than that they agree, hold their vigil and keep exactly the same days, and < serve* > God with watchings, supplications, concord, service, fasting, abstinence, purity and the other good things that please God, on this all-venerable day? But I think this is enough about this matter of the Audians' disagreement.

14,5 Audius suffered exile in his old age and was banished to Scythia by the emperor; < for > he was reported to the emperor by the bishops because of the rebellion of the laity. He lived there for the most part—I cannot say for how many years—and then went further on, even into the interior of Gothia. He instructed many Goths, and many monasteries therefore arose in Gothia itself, and the religious life, virginity and an ascetic discipline of no mean order. (6) In fact this body is absolutely < outstanding* > in its admirable conduct, and all their customs are well regulated in their monasteries, except for these points of contention, the difference in their Paschal Feast and their ignorant profession of the doctrine of the divine image.

15,1 But the worst, most fearful thing of all is that they will not pray with someone even if he is plainly respectable and they have nothing to

accuse him of—no charge of fornication, adultery or covetousness, but simply membership in the church. Besides, this is a fearful thing, to change the name of the Christians—the holy church, which has no additional name, but simply the name of Christ and Christians—< and > be named for Audius, and to make, and be required to make a covenant < against > the human race even though the group is outstanding in life,[46] pure and boasts of all righteousness.

15,2 For even after Audius' death many joined them and became bishops of his faction after him—one Uranius of Mesopotamia, and they got some men from Gothia and consecrated them as bishops, < including. . . >[47] and there was a Silvanus and certain others. But some of these have died, Uranius in particular. For he was proud to be a member of this group.

15,3 But many members were dispersed after the death of these bishops, Uranius and Silvanus of Gothia, and their body dwindled to a small one in Chalcis by Antioch, and the Euphrates region. (4) Indeed, the majority of them were hounded out of Gothia—not only they, but also the Christians of our kind who were there, when a great persecution was launched by a pagan king. He was a dreadful person; besides, he drove all the Christians out of those < territories* > from anger at the Romans, because the Roman emperors were Christian. But neither a root of wisdom nor a shoot of faith is wanting; even if they all appear to have been driven out, there must surely be < faithful > men there. It is not possible for the spring of faith to fail.

15,5 Many Audian refugees from Gothia came even here < to > our country, and lived as resident aliens for four years after that time. But they also withdrew once again < to > their Audian monasteries in the Taurus mountains, and in Palestine and Arabia. For they are widely dispersed by now but are still very few in number, and have few monasteries. But perhaps the group is still in two villages in the outer part of Chalcis, as I mentioned, and beyond Damascus and Mesopotamia, though, as I said, gready reduced in number.

15,6 But I think that is enough about this group in its turn. Once more, I shall pass them by and investigate the rest, so as to omit nothing about the divisions, splits, differences and schisms which have arisen in the world. For even though they are not that much changed in faith and

[46] Holl διακείμενον, MSS σεμνύμενον.
[47] A name appears to have fallen out at this point.

< different* > in behavior, if I can help it I am still not going to omit any separate group which has its own name.

Against Photinians.[1] *51, but 71 of the Series*

1,1 Photinus, the founder of the Photinians, flourished in our own time. Although he had been made a bishop of the holy catholic church he was taken with no light case of insanity but was madder than all before him, taking a view of the Son of God which was like Paul the Samosatian's and worse, and belching out confused blasphemies. (2) He came from Sirmium,[2] and was a bishop when he introduced this tare to the world in the reign of the emperor Constantius. < But > he has survived to this day, and was deposed by the western council which was assembled at Sardica,[3] for the stream of blasphemy which he spat up. (3) He claims that Christ does not exist from the beginning but is from Mary's time—since the Holy Spirit came upon her, he says, and he was conceived of the Holy Spirit. But the Holy Spirit is greater than Christ—says he, like a venturesome master builder, and a surveyor of the ineffable heights of heaven.

1,4 Photinus was all talk and glib tongue, but could fool many with his flow of words and readiness of speech. For though he was refuted many times by many opponents < he persisted in his defense of himself* >—even after his defense at Sardica, when he was summoned by the bishops to give an account of the heresy he had put forward. Indeed, on the plea that he had been deposed for nothing, he asked the emperor Constantius for another set of auditors, so as to prove that he had been deposed for no good reason. (5) And so at that time the emperor sent Thalassius, Datianus, Cerealius, Taurus, Marcellinus, Euanthius, Olympius, and Leontius to be the judges and auditors of his the defense he was going to make, with Basil of Ancyra examining and rebutting him or, indeed, accepting the points he would make in his own defense.

1,6 Photinus made a speech of some length to Basil with his words in the discussion. But he offered confused statements which, like a painted hussy's complexion, < had a meaning something like* > the sense of the

---

[1] Epiphanius' information comes chiefly from the stenographic record of Photinus' debate with Basil of Ancyra at the Council of Sirmium in 351 AD. See 2,8.

[2] Actually from Ancyra in Galatia.

[3] The Council of Sardica did not deal with Photinus. His first condemnation came at Antioch in 344, cf. Ath. Syn. 27.1 and the Ecthesis Macrostichus of the third Council of Antioch, c. 6 (Hahn, p. 194).

truth, but in his own mind were understood in an altered sense. (7) But when Basil and the audience < were caught > by his deceptive talk and the readiness of his speech for verbal trickery, the hotshot, even boastfully, profesed himself ready to cite a hundred texts in proof of his thesis. (8) For despite the < auditors' > frequent replies to him < he never stopped offering arguments* >—as I have found in the Speech to Basil,[4] in the parts they had the stenographers take down: Basil's deacon, Anysius; the governor Rufinus' secretary, Callicrates; the recorders Olympius, Nicetes and Basil; and the imperial notaries Eutyches and Theodulus. One volume was sent sealed to the emperor Constantius, one remained with Basil's council, and another, likewise sealed, < was left > with the court officials as the statements[5] of Photinus' opinion.

2,1 For any time Basil asked why the sacred scriptures teach that the Lord, the Word of God, is the Only-begotten before the ages and is with the Father, Photinus would accept the formula but, attaching a distinction to it, apply it partly to Christ but partly to the heavenly Word, drawing the analogy < of human nature >. (2) "For the Father said 'Let us make man in our image and after our likeness'[6] to his Word," said Photinus. "In what way? The Word was in the Father, but was not a Son. And 'The Lord rained from the Lord'[7] means the Word in the Father. (3) And scripture said 'I saw one like unto a son of man descending on the clouds'[8] predictively, and not as though the Son already existed. But because Christ would be called "Son" after Mary's time and after coming forth with flesh when he was born of the Holy Spirit and[9] of Mary," Audius says that all this is applied to him by anticipation, from the outset. (4) "But he was not yet < a Son >, he was a Word like the word in me." But I have said already that < he voiced* > opinions partly like those of Paul the Samosatian, but that he expressed others, and went even farther in his thinking.

3,1 But he too will be exposed as having reached the ultimate degree of the denial of God, and come to an opinion entirely foreign to eternal

---

[4] Other accounts of this debate are found at Soc. 2.30-43.35; Soz. 4.6.15. Both, however, make Photinus the loser.

[5] Holl: <ῥηματα> προβεβλημένα; MSS: ὑποβεβλημένα.

[6] Gen 1:26. A doctrine of this kind is condemned by c. 14 of the Anathemas of Sirmium, Ath. Syn. 27. Cf. the Formula Macrostichus.

[7] Gen 19:24. An heretical use of this text is condemned at ch. 17 of the Anathemas of the creed of Sirmium I (351) (Hahn p. 198). Cf. Ath. Syn. 27.3.

[8] Dan 7:13. The doctrine that the Old Testament ascribes divinity to the Son only predictively is condemned by c. 6 of the Ecthesis Macrostichus of the third Council of Antioch (Hahn p. 195).

[9] ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ ἀπὸ Μαρίας.

life. For if the Son is a latecomer in his Godhead then David is earlier—or rather, David is even to be preferred over his Maker. For Photinus meant this < in citing* > the sacred scripture—(2) or rather, in bypassing it in terms of his erroneous opinion—< and > said, "Even the apostle has said, 'The first *man* is of the earth, earthy, and the second *man* is from heaven.' "[10] (3) But the speech of the truth contradicts him at once, and refutes his mind. For the holy apostle said, "man," and [again], "man," and that *the first* "man," Adam, is of the earth, while the *second* is from heaven. (4) But Christ's flesh did not descend from heaven, though surely he said "man" [the second time]; even Photinus admits that it comes from Mary. Paul is not carelessly saying that flesh is from heaven, but means that the second man is from heaven, ever since the Word came down from on high and "dwelt among us,"[11] as the scripture says.

3,5 Now if the Lord < came from on high* >, he was pre-existent. < Photinus concedes* >, indeed, < that the scripture says* > that "He which hath found out every path of knowledge"[12] is with us, but that the actual < Finder of every path of knowledge is the Word in the Father; and he wants to prove this from the line following, "Then he appeared on earth." But anyone with sense can see* > that the sacred scripture does not doubt < the Son's preexistence* >, for "then"[13] and "hath found out every path of knowledge" imply his preexistence. Then "He appeared on earth" < indicates > his coming incarnation.

3,6 And as to their claim that he has brought the man from heaven, the apostle does not say < this >. He calls him "man" because of the union of his human nature [with his Godhead], < but secondly >, because of the amount of time between Adam and the incarnation. (7) But he says that he is "from heaven" because the divine Word has come from on high and < assumed > flesh, as the scripture says, "The Word was made flesh,"[14]—but not as though he supposes that the Word has come forth from the Father and been turned into flesh.[15] For this is the explanation that Photinus, with his deluded notion, gave of the passage.

---

[10] 1 Cor 15:47.
[11] John 1:14.
[12] Bar 3:37–38.
[13] μετὰ ταῦτα.
[14] John 1:14.
[15] The Anathemas of the creed of Sirmium I (351 AD) condemn this doctrine at c. 12 (Hahn pp. 197–198).

3,8 But if Adam is before the Word is, through whom was Adam himself created, and all God's creatures before him? To whom did the Father say, "Let us make man?"[16] (9) No one ever gives advice to the word within him or to his own spoken word;[17] God makes his all-wise statement < of > the coming creation of man to his immanent, holy Word, to teach us that the Son is with the Father from the beginning—so that we will not think that our creator is of recent origin, but that he is always with the Father before the ages. So John testifies by saying, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God."[18]

4,1 I say too, as the scum himself does, that the Word is from the beginning—but as a Son begotten < of > God. And if he is not God's Son Photinus' labor is for nothing, and so is his devotion, hope and purpose; for he is saying nothing more than the Jews who denied Christ. (2) The Gospel does not say of him, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was *in* God," but, "the Word was *with* God."[19] (3) And it does not say only that ["The Word] was in God," but that "The Word *was* God."[20] The immanent word which is always in man and is man's spoken word cannot be called, "man," but must be called, "man's word." (4) < But > if, as Photinus says, there was no Offspring yet [when the Word was "with God"], and if the divine Word was not yet God's Son, through whom were all things made? For the Gospel says, "All things were made *through him*, and without him was not anything made."[21]

4,5 But Photinus says, "As man does what he will through his reason, so the Father made all things by his own reason, through the Word that is in him." (6) Then why does the Lord say in the Gospel, "My Father worketh hitherto; I too work?"[22] However, "My Father worketh; I too work" does not mean that the Father is not at work in the work of the Son, or that the Son is separate from him and not at work in the Father's creation. (7) All the works there are, have been jointly performed by the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. For all things have been done through the Son by the Father, and the Son himself has done all things with the Father, and with the Holy

---

[16] Gen 1:26.

[17] The Anathemas of the creed of Sirmium I (351 AD) condemn the doctrine that Christ is either of these, ch. 8, (Hahn p. 197).

[18] John 1:1.

[19] John 1:1.

[20] John 1:1.

[21] John 1:3.

[22] John 5:17.

Spirit. "By the Word of the Lord were the heavens established, and all the host of them by the Spirit of his mouth."[23]

4,8 And so the Lord spoke with assurance in the Gospel, knowing the opinion of those who have gone astray, and spoke with divine foreknowledge, and with < an awareness > of the way in which each would deprive himself of the truth. < For > he told the Jews, "The Son doeth nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do."[24] And this is not because he sees first and then does; he has all things within himself and does what he will.

5,1 Well, Photinus, how will it come out? Or again, who is in you to offer us this tare? Who concocted this poison for the world? What gave you the wicked idea of adopting a blasphemous opinion of your Lord? (2) Hasn't Abraham convinced you by speaking to Christ and saying, "Shall not the judge of all the earth do judgment?"[25] Admit defeat, for the Son visited him—and not as an utterance, but as a real divine Word.

5,3 And to show you what happens to those who have spent their time on this, you would-be sage, < hear > how God has closed the subject for us in the sacred scripture by saying, "The Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorra fire and brimstone from the Lord out of heaven."[26] (4) And he didn't say, "The Lord's word," but, "The Lord, from the Lord," just as David says, "The Lord said unto my Lord."[27] And to < show > that the Son does not date only from the incarnation, he also says of his original [begetting], "From the belly before the morning star I begot thee."[28]

5,5 And no one will accept what you say of the Holy Spirit, you windbag and useless busybody! The Holy Spirit is neither "greater" nor "less;" "Who hath required this at your hands?"[29] says scripture. (6) But the holy Word himself confounds you; to acknowledge the legitimacy of his Godhead the Lord says of the Holy Spirit, "that proceeded from the Father and receiveth of me."[30]

6,1 And how many other proof texts are there? But since everyone can see that your nonsense is erroneous and untrue, and that it will be

---

[23] Ps 32:6.
[24] John 5:19.
[25] Gen 18:25. Chapter 15 of the Anathemas of Sirmium condemns anyone who says that the Son did not come to Abraham. Cf. ch. 6 of the Antiochene Symbol.
[26] Gen 19:24.
[27] Ps 109:1.
[28] Ps 109:3.
[29] Isa 1:12.
[30] Cf. John 15:26; 16:14.

detected not only by the wise but even by those who have a little knowledge of the text of the sacred scripture, and this frees me from the need of a great many proof texts or a long refutation—your tall tale and your wicked belief are easily refutable—(2) < I believe > that what I have said about you will do. I shall leave you behind as though I had squashed < some kind of > feeble bug with no strength that had grown up from the earth, or a worm or a maggot, with the foot of reason and the truth of the Word of God. (3) For this fool's sect has already been dispersed[31] in a short time. Calling on God as usual, I shall go on to the rest.

Against Marcellians.[1] *52, but 72 of the Series*

1,1 In his own turn Marcellus was born—all these people came at once—at Ancyra. Still < alive > till our day, he died about two years ago.[2] (2) He too caused a division in the church from the start of his career, and gave a slight adumbration of this when—due to the Arians' irritation with him over his anti-Arian pamphlet,[3] if you please—he was compared with Sabellius and Navatus. For this reason he is also attacked by certain < orthodox > for partly believing, as I said, in Sabellius' nonsense.

Some have said in his defense, however, that this was not so; they maintained that he had lived rightly and held orthodox opinions. There has therefore been a great deal of controversy about him. (3) His secret thoughts are known only to God. But either because they did not know his mind, or because they were giving his actual ideas, his converts and pupils would not confess the three entities, which is what the truth is—that there is one Godhead and one Glory, a co-essential Trinity with no differentiation of its own glory. It is a perfect Trinity and one Godhead, one power, one essence, and neither an identity nor a subordination.

1,4 But when he wanted in the worst way to prove his point to certain persons, he showed that < his > opinions were like those of Sabellius; hence this group too is refuted like a sect and counted as one. But again,

---

[31] Drexl and MSS εἰς ὀλίγον χρόνον, Holl εἰς ολίγον ἐλθοῦσα.

[1] Much of Epiphanius' information comes from Marcellus' Epistle to Julius of Rome, 2,1–3,1, fragments of Marcellus' writings preserved in George of Laodicea's refutation of Acacius of Galatia, 6,1–9,9, and the creed issued at Ancyra by Marcellus' disciples (11,1–12,5). But Epiphanius also uses oral sources. 4,4 recounts a conversation between himself and Athanasius.

[2] 376 or 377 AD. Cf. 66,2.

[3] Holl τὸ λόγιον, MSS τοῦ λογισμοῦ.

I subjoin a copy of the exposition of his argument that Marcellus wrote, (5) supposedly in his own defense, to Julius, the blessed bishop of Rome. From his defense [itself], and the document, it will be evident that his beliefs differed from the true faith. For if he did not think otherwise, why did he decide to offer a defense—if words which were issued by him were not right and disturbed certain people, and had brought < him > to this defense? Very well, here is the copy:

A Copy of a Letter of Marcellus, Whom the Council Deposed for Heresy

2,1 *Greetings in Christ from Marcellus to his most blessed fellow worker, Julius.*

Some who were formerly convicted of heresy, and whom I confuted at the Council of Nicaea, have dared to write your Reverence that my opinions are neither orthodox nor in agreement with the church, thus endeavoring to have the charge against themselves transferred to me. (2) *I therefore felt that I must come to Rome and suggest that you send for those who have written against me, so that I could prove, in a direct confrontation, that what they have written against me is untrue, and further, that they persist even now in their former error, and have dared dreadful ventures against the churches of God and us who head them.*

2,3 *But they have chosen not to appear, though you have sent presbyters to them and I have spent a year and three full months at Rome. On the eve of my departure, therefore, I feel that, with all sincerity and by my own hand, I must submit a written statement to you of the faith which I have learned and been taught from the sacred scriptures and remind you of the evils they have spoken, to acquaint you with the words with which, for their hearers' deception, they choose to conceal the truth.*

2,4 *For they say that the Son of the almighty God, our Lord Jesus Christ, is not his true and actual Word, but that God has a different word and a different wisdom and power. This person whom he has made is called Word, wisdom and power; and since they hold this opinion they say that he is another entity, separate from the Father.* (5) *They further declare in their writings that the Father is prior to the Son, < and > that the Son is not truly a son [begotten] of God. Even though they say he is "of God," they mean that he is "of God" just as all things are. And moreover, they dare to say that there was a time when he did not exist, and that he is a creature and a product of creation, and so separate him from the Father. It is my conviction, then, that persons who say these things are strangers to the catholic church.*

2,6 *Now I, following the sacred scriptures, believe that there is one God and his only-begotten Son, the Word, who is always with the Father and has never had a beginning, but is truly of God—not created, not made, but forever existent, forever reigning with God and his Father, "of whose kingdom," as the apostle testifies, "there shall be no end."*[4]

2,7 *This Son, this power, this wisdom, this true and actual Word of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, is a power inseparable from God, through whom all created things have been made as the Gospel testifies, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made through him, and without him was not anything made."*[5] (8) *He is the Word of whom Luke the Evangelist testifies, "Inasmuch as they have delivered, unto us, which were eye witnesses and ministers of the Word."*[6] *Of him David also said, "My heart hath burst forth with a good Word."*[7] (9) *So our Lord Jesus Christ has taught us through the Gospel by saying "I came forth from the Father and am come."*[8] *At the end of days he descended for our salvation, was conceived by the Holy Spirit, and assumed manhood.*

3,1 *Therefore I believe in one God the Almighty, and in Christ Jesus his only-begotten Son, our Lord, who was born of the Holy Spirit and Mary the Virgin, was crucified under Pontius Pilate, was buried, on the third day rose again from the dead, ascended into the heavens and is seated at the right hand of the Father, whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.*

And in the Holy Spirit, the holy church, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the flesh, and the life everlasting.

3,2 *I have learned from the sacred scriptures that the Godhead of the Father and of the Son cannot be differentiated. For if one separates the Son, that is, the Word, from Almighty God, he must either suppose that there are two Gods, which is agreed to be untrue to the sacred scripture, or else confess that the Word is not God, which likewise is plainly untrue to the right faith, since the Evangelist says, "and the Word was God."*[9] (3) *But I understand perfectly that the Father's power, the Son, is indistinguishable and inseparable [from him]. For the Savior himself our Lord Jesus Christ, says, "The Father*

---

4 Luke 1:33.
5 John 1:1–3.
6 Luke 1:2.
7 Ps 44:2.
8 John 8:42.
9 John 1:1.

is in me and I am in the Father,"[10] *"I and my Father are one,"*[11] *and, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."*[12]

3,4 *This faith, which I have both learned from the sacred scriptures and been taught by godly parents, I preach in God's church and have now written down for you, keeping a copy for myself.* (5) *I also request that you enclose a copy of it in your letter to the bishops, so that none of those who do not know me and my accusers well will be deceived by paying attention to what they have written. Farewell!*

The End

4,1 Those who can read this document, and those who can understand exactly what it says, < must > say whether it is all right. And if it is wrong, they must decide this for themselves. I do not wish to say anything more than I know and have been told. (2) For even though the document is right on the subject, those who read it and hear it read will suspect in their turn that Marcellus was not obliged to defend himself for nothing, or for no good reason, or because of < enmity > towards him—not unless he had belched out words that disturbed some and forced him to undertake his own defense because of things he had said.

4,3 For it may be that, even after falling into error, he defended and corrected himself with this document. Or he may have dressed his words up with the document to hide what he had said, and avoid exclusion by deposition from the college and order of bishops. At any rate, this is what I have learned about Marcellus.

4,5 However, I once asked the blessed Pope Athanasius myself how he felt about this Marcellus. He neither defended him nor, on the other hand, showed hostility towards him, but merely told me with a smile that he had not been far from rascality, but that he felt he had cleared himself.

5,1 But I shall cite the statements which some have found in Marcellus' own writings and felt reprehensible, and so have inveighed against him and written replies of their own. (2) Their replies to him < were brought to light* > by others in turn, for purposes of refutation, since those who had written in reply to him but later changed their minds < preferred to conceal what they had written earlier* >. < Hence >, in refutation of Acacius, these people issued Marcellus' statements and made them known in their own writings, during the disputes between Acacius, Basil of Galatia,

[10] John 10:38.
[11] John 10:30.
[12] John 14:9.

and George of Laodicea. (3) It was Acacius who, to refute Marcellus, had quoted passages from Marcellus' writings. < I shall cite them > to show by omitting none of the truth that I neither despise anything that may make for the correction of persons who try to prove untruths, nor wish to agree with such persons. And here are the passages from Acacius' argument against Marcellus:

The following citations are made because of Marcellus:

6,1 *After his misinterpretation of the comments on Proverbs, Marcellus wrote the things which follow and others like them, speaking unrighteously of God and lifting up his horn on high. Past the middle of the book he again quotes the words of Asterius, which say,* (2) *"For the Father is another, who has begotten of himself the only-begotten Word and the firstborn of all creation—Unique begetting Unique, Perfect begetting Perfect, King begetting King, Lord begetting Lord, God begetting God, the exact image of his essence, will, power and glory."*

6,3 *He quotes these words but objects to the "exact image"—that is, to the distinct, clear impress of God's essence, and the rest. Calling this notion a bad one, he appends his dissatisfaction and at this point writes:* (4) *"These words plainly reveal his poor opinion of Godhead. How can One who was begotten as Lord and God, as he himself has said earlier, still be an "image" of God? An image of God is one thing and God is another. If he is an image he is not Lord or God, but an image of a Lord and God. But if he is really Lord and really God, the Lord and God cannot be the image of a Lord and God."*

6,5 *And next, "He does not allow that he is any of the things he has mentioned; he calls him the 'image' of all these things. Very well, if he is the image of an essence, he cannot be self-existence. If he is the image of a will, he cannot be absolute will. If he is the image of power, he cannot be power; if of glory, he cannot be glory. For an image is not an image of itself but an image of something else."*

7,1 *You commended these words earlier, Marcellus, at the beginning of your book. But now, by denying that the God of God, the Word, is the Son and is Unique begotten of Unique, Perfect begotten of Perfect, you have plainly betrayed your poor opinion of the Godhead .* (2) *You ought to have cut your profane tongue out for understanding the image of the Great King < to be > lifeless and without Godhead, will, power, glory and essence, saying a word against the Lord, and dooming to death the soul that has committed such impiety.*

7,3 *For by limiting the image of God to lifelessness, < you are saying > that it is neither Lord, God, essence, will, power nor glory. You would have it be a motionless image of these things and make it an inert, lifeless image*

set outdoors, as inert < as though > it were the product of mere human skill. You will not have God's image be a living image of a living God, will not have the image of an essence be an essence, or have the exact image of will, power and glory be will, power and glory. (4) *But "exact" does not mean the same as "unoriginate;" it means that the divinity, and every action of the image is expressly and precisely like the divinity, and every action, of the Father.*

7,5 And later [Acacius says], *"Your lying < lips > should be put to silence that speak unrighteously against God, haughtily and with contempt."*[13] (6) *For even though you do not care for this and now prefer something else, the Father begot the Only-begotten as Unique begets Unique. The Son did not make his appearance because of Valentinus' aeons, but was begotten of a sole Father; and "Perfect begot Perfect." For there is no imperfection in the Father, and therefore there is none in the Son; the Son's perfection is the legitimate offspring of the Father's perfection and more than perfection.*

And "A King begot a King." (7) *It is orthodox doctrine that God rules < before the > [rule] of the Son, who was begotten before the ages and is a King who himself has a ruler; through him the rest are ruled, and he gratefully acknowledges his subjection [to the Father]. The Father has not begotten a subject but a King "whose kingdom hath neither beginning of days nor length of life."*[14] *For his rank is not a thing external to him but belongs to his essence, as is the case with the Father who begot him. And therefore scripture says, "Of his kingdom there shall be no end."*[15]

7,8 *But we confess that "Lord begets Lord" in this way, and "God begets God." And in a word, we say he is the image of an essence, a will, a power and a glory—not inert and dead but essential, possessed of a will, powerful and glorious.* (9) *For power does not beget powerlessness, but absolute power. Glory does not beget the absence of glory, but absolute glory. Will does not beget the absence of will, but absolute will. Essence does not beget the absence of essence, but self-existence.*

The divine Word is therefore an image, a living wisdom, subsistent, an active Word and Son, himself invested with being. This < was > the image "in which" God "daily rejoiced, when he delighted in his completion of the world."[16] (10) *But since you, Marcellus, have "denied these things before men, you will be denied," by that image itself, "before the Father which is*

[13] Ps 30:19.
[14] Heb 7:3.
[15] Luke 1:33.
[16] Prov 8:30–31.

in heaven."[17] *You will also, however, be denied before the church which is under heaven, and which has written of you in all parts of the world, "Hear the word of the Lord, write of this man, A man rejected; for no ruler, still seated upon David's throne, shall grow any more from his seed."*[18]

8,1 And later, after Marcellus has mentioned the words of Asterius, he goes on, *You quote these words and persist in your denial of our Savior's image and essence; of his only-begotten sonship to the Father and his status as firstborn of all creation; of the uniqueness of the Only-begotten, his perfection begotten of the Perfect, his kingship begotten of the King, his lordship begotten of the Lord, and his Godhead begotten of God. In a word, [you persist in] your denial of the exact image of the essence, will, power and glory of God.* (2) *You "deny this before men" in words of no little import—" and therefore will be denied before his Father"*[19]*—and write next to this, "These words clearly demonstrate his poor opinion of the Godhead of the Father and the Son." But your denial of them has plainly exposed your perverse and mean heresy with regard to the Godhead and essence of Christ.*

9,1 And later he adds some words of Marcellus': *His next addition is worthless: "He will not allow him to be any of the things which he has mentioned, for he says that he is the 'image' of all these. Very well, if he is the image of an essence, he cannot be self-existence. If he is the image of a will, he cannot be absolute will. If he is the image of power, he cannot be power; and if of glory, he cannot be glory. For an image is not its own image, but an image of something else."* (2) *But these remarks are worthless, Marcellus, and lies. When Asterius says, "A King begot a King; a Lord begot a Lord; God begot God," he would have him be everything that he has mentioned. And he destroys your lifeless image, which in your view is a product of mere human skill.* (3) *He is saying that the Son is a living image of all these and the impress of the image of a living Begetter, and is calling him self-existence, the image of an essence; absolute will, the image of will; absolute power, the image of power; absolute glory, the image of glory—and not its own glory, but the glory of another image.*

9,4 *But by not confessing that the Son is God of God, light of light or power of power, you do not let the Son be God, light, power, essence, will or glory. In sum, the [lifeless] body [of your "image"] impiously does away with these*

[17] Cf. Matt 10:32.
[18] Jer 22:29–30.
[19] Cf. Matt 10:32.

things, together with the Son.[20] (5) *You also deny that " 'The Word was God,"*[21] *and either call him God's Son in name only, or else in the sense that [any] man [can be called God's son]—making God the begetter of something different from himself, who begets the Son by adoption, as in "I have begotten sons and raised them up,"*[22] *"Ye have received the Spirit of adoption,"*[23] *and, "Ascribe to the Lord, O sons of God."*[24]

9,6 *Thus, in saying that the Son is the exact image of the Father's essence, power, will and glory, Asterius as good as says that the Father's attributes inhere in the Son, and that what is conceived of the Father is impressed in or given to the Son, and is not different from him.* (7) *Thus he would have the Son be everything he has said. For he does not take the "image" as a painted image, or introduce a third artist to paint the qualities of someone different from the Father in some other place, and call this a "Son."* (8) *For whether intentionally or not, this is what you are saying [with your] "Very well, if he is the image of an essence, he cannot be self-existence; and if of a will, he cannot be absolute will."*

For in our view, if he is the living image of an essence, he can be, and is self-existence. And thus we call the image of an essence an essence, because of its most faithful reproduction of its life and activity. And we call the image of a will, a will, "the angel of a great counsel";[25] *and the image of power and glory, power and glory.* (9) *And texts which support this are, "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself,"*[26] *and, "As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, < even so the Son quickeneth whom he will >."*[27] *For the [combination of the words] "as" and "thus" implies the exact reproduction of the portraiture and likeness which are proper to an image.*

10,1 And a little later, *For the divine Word who provides life, beauty and form for others, is not to be conceived of as himself without life, beauty and form, or dead or non-existent. He is informed with the Father's attributes, and not as though he were different, with attributes different from the form. His attributes inhere in his existence, and his existence in his attributes.* (2) *But because the image—someone else's image as you yourself agree, and*

---

[20] Holl τοῦ υἱου, MSS τούτων.
[21] John 1:1.
[22] Isa 1:2.
[23] Rom 8:15.
[24] Ps 28:1.
[25] Isa 9:5.
[26] John 5:26.
[27] John 5:21.

not its own—possesses the attributes of its original, it displays otherness, but otherness as though it were likeness. For as "the image of the invisible God,"[28] *which it is, this image is not an image of itself, but an image of another person.*

10,3 *In motion, activity, power, will and glory, then, the Son is the image of the Father, a living image of a living God—not a lifeless or inert image, which has its being in something else and is drawn on something else, but is not in motion in and through itself. And it is an exact image, though the exactitude makes it, not the Father, but a Son in the exact likeness [of the Father].*

The end of the excerpt from Acacius.

10,4 However, orthodox persons, brethren of mine and confessors, say that they have received a confessional statement in defense of Marcellus' faith from some of the disciples he left behind him. I publish its subtleties here, since I do not understand it myself. Here is the copy:

A Written Statement of the Faith of Marcellus' Disciples

11,1 *Greetings in the Lord from the presbyters of Ancyra in Galatia, Photinus, Eustathius, another Photinus, Sigerius, the deacon Hyginus, the subdeacon Heraclides, the lector Elpidius, and the proctor Cyriacus, to the most reverend and holy bishops in Diocaesarea who have been banished for the orthodox faith in our Savior Jesus Christ, Eubgius, Adelphius, Alexander, Ammonius, Harpocration, Isaac, Isidore, Annubio, Pitimus, Euphratius and Aaron.*[29]

11,2 *While we were staying with your Reverences our countrymen, during the visit we fittingly made you, we were asked by your Holinesses how we hold the faith that is in us. Both because we approve of your solicitous inquiry, and particularly because those who so choose are spreading certain lies about us to no purpose,* (3) *we feel we must assure you, not only through the letter of fellowship your Holinesses have been shown which was addressed to us all by the thrice blessed Pope Athanasius, but also through this written confession of ours,* (4) *that we neither believe, nor have believed, anything other than the worldwide and church-wide creed determined at Nicaea. We offer this confession because we can assure you*[30] *that this is our belief,* (5) *and we condemn those who dare to say that < the Son or > the Holy Spirit is a creature; and the Arian heresy, and the heresies of Sabellius, Photinus*

[28] Col 1:15.

[29] These presbyters are referred to at Theodoret H. E. 4.22.35; Basil Ep. 265; Facundus v. Hermiane pro Defensione Trium Capitum 42; Palladius Hist. Laus. 46.

[30] Holl, tentatively δυνάμενοι ὑμᾶς πληροφορεῖν, MSS δυνάμει τοῦτο φρονεῖν.

and Paul the Samosatian; and those who deny that the Holy Trinity consists of three infinite, subsistent, co-essential, co-eternal and absolute Persons. (6) *We also condemn those who say that the Son is an expansion, contraction or activity of the Father, and those who do not confess that the divine Word, the Son of God, is before the ages and co-eternal with the Father, and is subsistent, absolute Son and God.*

12,1 *If anyone says that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are the same, let him be anathema.*

If anyone attributes a beginning or end to the Son and Word of God or to his kingdom, let him be anathema.

If anyone says that the Son or the Holy Spirit is a part of the Father, and does not confess that the Son of God was begotten of the Father's essence before anyone can conceive of it, let him be anathema.

12,2 *As to the incarnation of the divine Word, the only-begotten Son of God, we confess that < the > Son of God has also become man without sin, by the assumption of all of human nature, that is, of a rational and intellectual soul and human flesh.*

12,3 *We believe in one God the Father Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible, and in one Lord fesus Christ the Son of God, begotten as the Only-begotten of the Father, that is, of the Father's essence, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, co-essential with the Father, through whom all things were made in heaven and on earth;*

Who for us men and for our salvation came down and was incarnate and made man, suffered and rose the third day, ascended into the heavens, and will come to judge the quick and the dead; and in the Holy Spirit.

12,4 *But those who say that there was a time when the Son of God did not exist, and that he did not exist before his begetting, and that he was made from nothing or that he is of another substance or essence, or that he is mutable or alterable, them the catholic and apostolic church condemns.*

12,5 *I, Photinus, presbyter of the catholic church at Ancyra, believe and hold as is written above.*

< I >, Eustathius, presbyter of the catholic church at Ancyra, believe and hold as is written above.

I, Photinus, presbyter of the same, believe and hold as is written above.

I, Sigerius, presbyter of the same, believe and hold as is written above.

I, Hyginus, deacon of the same, believe and hold as is written above.

I, Heraclides, sub-deacon of the same, believe and hold as is written above.

I, Elpidius, lector of the same, believe and hold as is written above.

I, Cyriacus, proctor of the same, believe and hold as is written above.

12,6 This is what they wrote to the confessors and fathers. If the wise can take it to be a commendable statement it should be categorized as such. On the other hand, if there are accidental unorthodoxies even there, in the argument they use in their actual defense of themselves, the scholarly, once more, should put it in that category. But since I have given all the above information about Marcellus, I shall pass him by in his turn and go on to investigate the rest.

Against Semi-Arians[1] *53, but 73 of the series*

1,1 By God's power we have torn Arius' abominable doctrines up, which he originally belched out like a man overtaken with drunkenness, and the doctrines of his successors—I mean Photinus, and Marcellus too during the short time in which he seemed to be shaken. May Arius' pupils be set straight, if indeed they can be!

But now that, with the word of God "which is sharper than any two-edged sword,"[2] we have cut down the tares which sprouted from Arius himself, let us survey the tangled woodland which has grown up from Arius, to see how some are halfway Arians, (2) who repudiate his name but adopt the man and his heresy. By some pretense they falsely put on a different mask, as the acting of stage performers is a sham, and they conceal their faces with different masks, and inside the masks recite the shameful, boozy lines of the comedy—a new comedy, or the myths of the ancients, since their poets used to do the same. (3) Thus, though these people would like to mislead the simple, they are the same as Arius and the Arian Nuts—on the surface, in their behavior, and in their heresy. (4) But in the desire to pretty up their perverse doctrine, as a deceitful piece of flattery they call the Son of God a creature but cheaply add, "We do not mean a creature like any other creature or an offspring like any other offspring"—as a piece of deception and to do the Son of God a favor, as well as to soothe those who are frightened by this expression. And yet they altogether reject the homoousion supposedly because it is untrue to the sacred scripture! (5) I have discussed this with extreme thoroughness in the Sect about Arius.

---

[1] The literary sources of this Sect are the Epistles of Basil of Ancyra (2,1–11,11) and George of Laodicea (12,1–22,8); the encyclical of the Council of Seleucia, 359 AD (25–26); and the inaugural homily of Melitius at Antioch, 360 AD (29–33). All of these are quoted.

[2] Heb 4:12.

But to suggest a word similar to "homoousion" they say—I mean the followers of Basil and George, the leaders of this Semi-Arian sect—"We do not say, 'homoousion,' but 'homoeousion.' " (6) These were the members of the Council < at Ancyra >[3] who separated from the sect of the Arian Nuts itself—their leader, Basil of Ancyra, and George of the Laodicea by Antioch in Daphne, or Coele-Syria.

1,7 Their view of the Holy Spirit too is the same as that of the Pneumatomachi. [In the case of the Spirit] they no longer begin as they do with the Son, with a sort of shame or with a word expressive of hesitancy. They are ashamed to say that the Son is altogether a creature, though this is what they think, but from fear of men they add the homoeousion, and the doctrine that the Son is a creature < but not > like any other. But with the Holy Spirit, as I said, they do not begin hesitantly, but like ravening dogs pitilessly declare him a creature in every respect, and thus also maintain that he is different from the Father and the Son.

1,8 And lest it be said that I accuse anyone falsely, I shall cite a letter here as each of them wrote it—Basil, one, but George of Laodicea together with Basil and his companions, another. And here are the letters.

2,1 *Greetings in the Lord from the holy council, assembled from various provinces at Ancyra at the approach of Easter, to the most honored Masters, our colleagues in Phoenicia and elsewhere, who are of one mind with us.*

2,2 *After the trial of the church's faith, as though by fire, by the ordeals for the faith which took place in our midst; and < after > the proceedings at Constantinople because of Marcellus,*[4] *and the issuance of the creed at the council gathered for the dedication of the church in Antioch*[5] *and afterwards at Sardica,*[6] *and the faith that bloomed again there—and further, after the proceedings at Sirmium*[7] *with regard to Photinus* (3) *and still further, after the explanations we issued of each article of the creed when questioned by those who differed with the easterners at Sardica,*[8] *it is our prayer that we*

---

[3] Held in 358 AD See below at 2,1.

[4] The Synod of Constantinople, 336 AD, confirmed Arius' deposition and condemned Marcellus for a too close identification of the Word with the Father. Cf. Soc. 1.36.8; Soz. 2.33; Eusebius Contra Marcellum 2.4.29.

[5] The Second Concil of Antioch, 341 AD, issued four creeds. Basil is probably referring to the second, which calls the Son the "exact image of the Godhead, essence, will, power and glory of the Father," Hahn pp. 184–186; Ath. Syn. 23.3; Soc. 2.10.76; Hilary De Synodis 29.

[6] The Council of Sardica, 343 AD, split into a council of western and a council of eastern bishops; the easterns reissued the fourth creed of Antioch with anathemas added.

[7] The first Council of Sirmium, 351 AD, condemned Photinus.

[8] Probably the Ecthesis Macrostichus, an extensive explanation of the creed of the easterns at Sardica, which was presented before the emperor Constantius at the third Council

may rest at last and, with all stumbling blocks removed and the church from east to west united under the pious rule of our master Constantius, be at peace and attend to the divine services.

2,4 *But the devil, it seems, does not abandon his utmost endeavors to foment apostasy in every way through his peculiar vessels, < as > was foretold by the Lord and, correspondingly, declared by the holy apostle for the protection of the faithful.* (5) *For by devising rebellions against the faith of the church he is even now < attempting* > to claim certain individuals for his own "with a form of godliness,"[9] and through them has invented < novelties* > and "profane new babblings"[10] against the legitimacy of the only-begotten Son of God.*

When we heard formerly that some were running about in Antioch, but also in Alexandria, and further, in Lydia or Asia, and planting sparks of impiety in the souls of the simple, (6) *we hoped that, due to the audacity of the impiety and < the > extent of their shamelessness, the heresy they have invented had been quenched, and the evil suppressed, by the championship of the Masters, our colleagues, in each locality.*

2,7 *But since persons from the places aforesaid next arrived, and persons from Illyria, and informed us that the inventors of this evil are zealous in the venture of doing harm to a larger number and infecting them with a leaven of wickedness, we could brook no further delay.* (8) *Since, moreover, we have read the letter, copies of which we subjoin, of our like-minded colleague, George of the church of Laodicea,*[11] *and since we respect the testimonies of those who have witnessed to us before God,* (9) *as many of us have gathered as could do so given the season, the approach of the holy day of Easter—the winter was a hindrance to many, as they have indicated by letter—and hastened to set forth the norm of the faith in the following form.* (10) *As far as the remaining points are concerned, < we are in agreement* > with the council at Antioch, as we have said, and the creed the Council at Sirmium accepted*[12] *which was issued at the dedication as well as at Sardica, and with the arguments that were presented at Sirmium. < It is our purpose > to give an accurate description of the catholic church's faith in the holy Trinity, as*

---

of Antioch in 345. It contains the formula, "like the Father in all respects," which Basil's letter emphasizes. Cf. Ath. Syn. 26.6; Soc. H. E.2.9.11.

[9] 2 Tim 3:5.

[10] 1 Tim 6:20.

[11] This letter is thought to be lost. It is not the letter given at Soz. 4.13.2–3, which says nothing about Laodicea, but reports the situation at Antioch.

[12] The fourth Creed of the second Council of Antioch (341 AD), reissued in 341 by the easterns at Sardica, and in 351 by the first Council of Sirmium.

we said, and of the form of the innovation besides, replying to it only as the Spirit has permitted us.

2,11 *And because you, most honored Sirs and colleagues, have stood firm in the faith which has been handed down to us from our fathers, and because our faith, as we believe, is in accord with yours, we urge you, on reading this, to append your signatures. Thus those who dare to introduce this impiety will be assured that we have accepted, and guard as our inheritance, the faith < of the > fathers, < transmitted > from the time of the apostles, through the intervening generations, even to us.* (12) *Hence they will either be ashamed and submit to correction, or persist in error and be expelled from the church, < for > preparing, by their own efforts, the falling away for the son of iniquity who threatens to venture "to sit even in the temple of God."*[13]

3,1 *Our faith is in a Father, a Son and a Holy Spirit. For so our Lord Jesus Christ taught his disciples, "Go make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."*[14] (2) *Therefore we who are born again into this faith should have a godly understanding of the meanings of the names. For he did not say, "Baptize them in the name of the Incorporeal and the Incarnate," or, "of the Immortal and of Him who knew death," or, "of the Ingenerate and the Generate,"*[15] *but "In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."* (3) *And thus, since we also hear < the > names in nature, and < a father* > there < always begets a son like himself* >,*[16] *we may understand the "Father" to be the cause of an essence like his. And when we hear the name, "Son," we may understand that the Son is like the Father whose Son he is.*

3,4 *We have therefore believed in a Father, a Son and a Holy Spirit, not in a creator and a creature. For "creator and creature" are one thing but "father and son " are another, since these two concepts differ in meaning.* (5) *If I say, "creature," I must first say, "creator;" < and if I say* >, "son," I must first say, "father." But even the term, "Son," is not quite right* >, since it is taken from physical things, and [used] because of the passions and effluents of flesh and blood fathers and sons. < If we exclude these, however* >, it does plainly mean the existence of the incorporeal Son of an incorporeal Father.* (6) *Thus < our Lord refrained from putting the term* >, "creature," [into the baptismal*

---

[13] 2 Thes 2:14.

[14] Matt 28:19.

[15] Such descriptions of the Father and the Son are termed inadequate at Ath. Nic. 31.3; Or. I C. Ar. 32; Or. II C. Ar. 41; 42.

[16] Athanasius uses a similar argument, but in favor of the homoousion, at Ath. Or. I C. Ar. 26.

formula], because it entailed a notion of something corporeal. And since the creature the Father makes < is a "son" >, < God called > him "Son" by borrowing from the notions of "creator" and "creature" only the creator's impassibility with respect to the creature, and the creature's stability—the result of the impassibility—and its being as the > creator intended, (7) *and has plainly taught us the whole notion of the Father and the Son from [the parallels of] a physical father and son, < and > a physical creator and creature.*

For with its externality eliminated from "creature," its materiality, and all else that the name, physical "creature," implies, all that remains of "creature" is the notion of impassibility—I mean the impassibility of its creator—and the notion of the creature, and of its being as its creator intended, is complete. (8) *If, again, we then eliminate the rest from the notion of "creator" and "creature," and take only the notion that a creature is made by an impassible creator and is perfect, stable and as its creator intended, it follows—since we have been taught above all to believe in a Father and a Son—that as orthodox Christians believe, we form one particular idea of the terms, "Father" and "Son."*

4,1 *Thus if, in addition to these things, we eliminate anything that has to do with passion or effluent, < and so > understand that the Father is the Father of a Son, and that the Son was not physically engendered and brought to maturity by natural physical things which, as is characteristic of physical things, are constantly made to grow and decay, only the notion of likeness will be left.* (2) *For as we shall say once more of a creature that >, when < all physical features > were eliminated, its creator's impassibility was left, and a < notion > of the creature's perfection, of its being as its creator intended, and of its stability, so we shall say of the Father and the Son that, with all physical features eliminated, only the generation of a living being of like essence will be left—for every "father" is understood to be the father of an essence like his.* (3) *If, however, along with the elimination of all other physical notions from the terms, "Father, " and "Son," the one which enables us to think of the Father as the cause > of a living being of like essence is also eliminated, our faith will no longer be in a Father and a Son but in a creator and a creature. And the terms, < "Father," and "Son," > will be unnecessary, since they contribute nothing of themselves. And thus, as God, he will be a creator < but > in no way at all a Father.*

4,4 *For it is plain from natural considerations that the "Father" does not mean the Father of an activity but of an essence like himself, whose subsistence corresponds with a particular activity. God has many activities, and is understood to be a creator from another activity whereby he is the creator of heaven, earth and everything in them, and of things invisible as well. But as*

the Father of the Only-begotten he is seen to be, not a creator but a Father who has begotten [a Son].

4,5 *But if, from motives of reverence, < someone > removes the legitimate notion of the relationship of the Father and the Son because of his idea of the sufferings of physical paternity and sonship, and his fear that the Incorporeal may suffer some effect in begetting unless his Offspring and the effects of physical paternity and sonship are incomplete, whatever he says, he will be saying that the Son is another creature, and never that the Son is a son.* (6) *Even if he says he surpasses [other creatures] in greatness as heaven surpasses a mountain or hill, he will regard him as < being one >*[17]*—even though he is thought to excel in greatness, in utility as the first creature to be made, or as serving for the creation of the rest;*[18] *even so he will not remove him from the category of creatures.* (7) *For just as taking a coal from the altar with tongs rather than with the hand itself is the same thing, even < though > the bronze work, the overlaying of the iron, is done with the hand—for both the tongs and the iron that is overlaid by the hand are creatures—even so, the One through whom all creatures were made will not be different from the creatures unless he is a Son, as the natural concept [of "son"] suggests. If he is made, he will be the first of created things and will become the maker's instrument by which the creator makes all things.*

5,1 *And let no one ingeniously derive the notion of "Father" in the proper sense, and "Son" in the proper sense, from the things more commonly called "sons," since in this sense there will be many sons of God—< as > when scripture says, "I have begotten sons and brought them up, and they have rebelled against me;"*[19] *"Have we not all one Father?"*[20] *"As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, which were bom, not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God"*[21]*—and also of inanimate objects, "Who hath begotten drops of dew?"*[22] (2) *These texts will prove instead, from the < meaning > common [to all of them], that the Son is not a son just as these things are not, but that, being a creature like them, he shares the mere title of "son."*

5,3 *But the church has believed that God is not only a creator of creatures—Jews and Greeks understand this—but is also the Father of an Only-*

---

17 Athanasius himself uses this argument at Or. II C. Ar. 20f.
18 So Arius in his Thaleia; Or. 1 Ath. C. Ar., 26.
19 Isa 1:2.
20 Mal 2:10.
21 John 1:12–13.
22 Job 38:28.

begotten. He possesses not only his creative activity whereby he is understood to be a creator, but a generative activity peculiar and unique to himself, whereby we understand him to be the Father of a unique Offspring. (4) *It is to teach us this that the blessed Paul writes, "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named."*[23] *< For as fathers on earth are termed "fathers" > because they have sons in the likeness of their own essences, so we name the One for whom the fathers on earth were named "fathers" in accordance with their essences, "Father in the heavens"—for he surely has the Son begotten of him in the likeness of his own essence.*

5,5 *And the notion of "sons" which applies to things that are loosely and equivocally so called cannot fit the Only-begotten. For as a "box tablet" properly speaking means a tablet made of boxwood, but more commonly and in the colloquial sense of the word, a tablet made of lead, bronze or any other material < is called* > a "box tablet" after the boxwood tablet, < so only the Son begotten of the Father is properly termed "Son of God," while the others are so named in the loose sense of the word. * >* (6) *Nor < is he named "son" in the sense of, "Who hath begotten drops of dew?" Properly speaking, God did not "beget" dew* >, that is, not in actuality; here the word for begetting an offspring is colloquially applied to a created object. And he is not called "Son" in the sense of, "I have begotten sons and brought them up"; here too the term is loosely applied, because of [God's] good will and respect towards them.* (7) *Nor is he called "Son" < in the sense of >, "He gave them power to become sons of God"; this too is derived < from > the idea of virtuous creation in his own image. The Only-begotten is < not > to be understood as Son in these senses but in the proper one, as an only Son begotten of an only Father, in the essential likeness of the Father whose Son he is called, and is understood to be.*

6,1 *But suppose that, from the incapacity of his reasoning powers, someone refuses to accept this line of reasoning on the grounds that the Father must be subject to some passion, division or effluence if he is to be conceived as this sort of father—and has [thus] mutilated the godly conception of the Father and the Son, and requires reasons for it.* (2) *He must be required to provide reasons why God is crucified, and why "the foolishness" of the proclamation of the Gospel—[called "foolishness"] because of its unreasonableness in the eyes of those whom the world counts as wise—is wiser than men. The blessed Paul did not consider these persons worthy of notice, since by the*

[23] Eph 3:14–15; cf. the Fourth Antiochene Symbol.

unreasonableness of power God has "made the wisdom" of persons with the ability to reason "foolish." (3) *For Paul said, "I came declaring unto you the mystery of God, not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect."*[24] *The blessed Paul did not consider these persons worthy of notice, since by the unreasonableness of power God has "made the wisdom" of persons with the ability to reason "foolish."*[25] (3) *For Paul said, "I came declaring unto you the mystery of God, not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect."*[26] *Anyone who, with wisdom of words, demands < reasons > for the mystery, should disbelieve the mystery, since his portion is with the wisdom which has been made foolish. For even though such a person disbelieves from wisdom of words, Paul < chooses to preach "only in demonstration of the Spirit and of power"* * >[27] *"lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect."*[28]

6,4 *But if he replies in this way he does not do so with wisdom of words, but by the unreasonableness of power confounds all wisdom which is based on reasoning and accepts faith alone for the salvation of those who receive the Gospel.* (5) *He does not answer [by explaining] how the Father begets the Son without passion, or the mystery of the Only-begotten's sonship to the Father might be robbed of its significance. He confounds the wisdom of the wise, which is "made foolish"*[29]*—as scripture says, "Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world?"*[30]*—but not with verbal wisdom, so that the < mystery > will not be rendered meaningless by suspicions occasioned by arguments. I mean that < the > godly conception of the Father and the Son—but a Father and a Son with no passions—declares, without deriving the idea from reason, that the Father had begotten the Son of himself without emission or passion, and that a Son like his Father in essence has been begotten of the Father, Perfect of Perfect, an only-begotten entity. [These are doctrines] which are either < believed > by the faithful, or suspected < by the unbelieving >.*

6,7 *For only a fool would hear of Wisdom originating from a wise God, as the Father of the Wisdom begotten of him wisely knows, and attribute passion to the Father < because > Wisdom originated from him—if, [that is], the*

---

[24] 1 Cor 2:1; 1:17.
[25] Cf. 1 Cor 1:25.
[26] Cf. 1 Cor 2:1; 1:17.
[27] 1 Cor 2:4.
[28] 1 Cor 1:17.
[29] Cf. Ath. Or. C. Ar. I 28.
[30] 1 Cor 1:20.

Wisdom essentially like the wise God is to originate from him. (8) *For, if we are not to conceive of the wise God as compoundedly wise by participation in wisdom, he is himself wise, himself an essence, without compounding, and the wisdom by which he is known is not the Son. The Wisdom which is the Son is an essence begotten of the essence of the Wise, which is Wisdom. The Son will subsist as an essence like the essence of the wise Father, from whom the Son originated as Wisdom.*

7,1 *And so the blessed Paul, with his excellent training in Hebrew lore, was accustomed, by the inspiration of the same Spirit who spoke in the Old and the New Testaments, to derive the same notions as the ones in the two Psalms, "Thy judgments are a great deep,"*[31] *and "Thy paths are in deep waters, and thy footsteps shall not be known."*[32] *But he altered the language about God's judgments < by replacing > "great deep" with "O the depth of the riches;"*[33] *"Thy paths are in deep waters and thy footsteps shall not be known" with "unsearchable;" and "Thy judgments are a great deep" with "Thy judgments are past finding out."*

7,2 *And because Wisdom itself had taught him its notion of the Father and itself, and of its relation to created things, Paul in his own writings presents us with the idea of the Father and the Son, and the things which have been created by the Father through the Son, in the following manner.* (3) *For Wisdom had said, "I, Wisdom, give counsel a home"*[34] *and so forth, and gone on to explain "by whom?"—for it said, "By me are kings,"*[35] *and "If I shall tell you the things that are by me, I shall remember to recount the things of old."*[36] *It said, "The Lord created me the beginning of his ways, for his works. Before the age he established me, and before all things he begets me;"*[37] (4) *but for "beginning" Paul understood "first,"*[38] *and for "begets me," "-born."*[39] *And for the entire sentence, "He created me the beginning of his ways and begets me," the apostle understood "firstborn of every creature." For "he established" Paul understood "In him are all things created"; for "By me are the things of old," "Whether thrones or principalities or powers or authorities, all things were created by him and for him."*

---

31 Ps 35:7.
32 Ps 76:20.
33 The New Testament quotations in 7,1 are taken from Rom. 11:33.
34 Prov 8:12.
35 Prov 8:15.
36 Prov 8:21a.
37 Prov 8:22; 23a; 25b.
38 The New Testament citations in 7,4–8 are from Col. 1:15–16.
39 πρωτότοκος: firstborn.

7,5 *Thus all < the > apostle's phrases are word for word equivalents of the things that were said by Wisdom. That is, "beginning" is equivalent to "first," "begets" to "-born," and "He created me the beginning of his ways, for his works," to "firstborn of every creature." "In him were created" is a substitute for "He established me," and "All things are by him" for "By me are the things of old."* (6) *It is thus evident < that > neither did the "image" originate from passion, but that it must be understood in the sense of "I, Wisdom"; and that, as Wisdom is the Son of the Wise, an essence which is the Son of an essence, so the image is like the essence. The "image" too was understood as "of God the invisible."* (7) *And we have the equivalents for all the words: "God" for "wise," "image" for "wisdom," "first" for "beginning," and "-born" for "first."*

But we can also give the equivalents of whole phrases. "Firstborn of every creature" is the equivalent of "He created me the beginning of his way, for his works, and begets me." "In him were created" is the equivalent of "He established me." "All things are by him and for him" is the equivalent of "by me." (8) *It is thus plain that not only Paul exposes the entire wrongness*[40] *of those who hear that the Son "is the* image *of the invisible God," and try to quibble shamelessly about the Son's likeness of essence to the Father. John before him, truly the son of thunder, similarly sounded the godly conception of the Son forth to us with his own loud peal—from the clouds, as it were, of the riddles of Wisdom.*

8,1 *For see how he too transmitted the truths he had learned from Wisdom in the Gospel he proclaimed to us.* (2) *Because Wisdom had said, "He created me the beginning of his ways,"*[41] *John used the phrase, "in the beginning" in his "In the beginning was the Word." And for "He created me" John substituted "And the Word was God,"*[42] *so that we would not take this to mean the spoken word, but the divine Word < begotten > of the Father without passion, as a stable entity. And for "I was by him,"*[43] *John substituted "And < the Word > was God."* (3) *For "Through me are the things from of old"*[44] *John substituted "All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made."*[45] *For "She hath founded"*[46] *John substituted "That which was made, in him was life,"*[47] *which means the same as "In him were*

---

[40] Holl and MSS παραπέσοντας Eltester, lacuna, or παραπεσεῖν.
[41] Prov 8:22.
[42] John 1:1.
[43] Prov 8:30.
[44] Cf. Prov 8:23.
[45] John 1:2.
[46] Cf. Prov 8:25.
[47] John 1:3–4.

all things created."[48] (4) *He said, "The Word was made flesh,"*[49] *to correspond with "Wisdom hath builded her house."*[50] *He substituted "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise"*[51] *for "I was by him in accord with him."*[52] *John thus has < the confirmatory testimony * > of two or three witnesses to prove the Son's likeness of essence to the Father.* (5) *For one witness says that the Wisdom of the wise God is his Son; one, that the Word of God is the only-begotten God; one, that the Son is the image of God. Thus it is proclaimed by all that the Word, Wisdom and Image of God is in all respects like him, as we have said, and that he is the essential Son of his God and Father.* (6) *Still more, when God's Word says, "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself,"*[53] *he is educating us, like Thomas, by contact with the actuality of the likeness of essence.* (7) *For if "as the Father hath" does not mean what it would in something else—(the Father is not one thing and the life in him something else, so that the one thing means the possessor and the other the thing possessed. The Father himself is uncompoundedly life, and has granted the Son < to have life > as he does—plainly, to have it uncompoundedly, like the Father.) [Thus] it is plain that in having life in this way, since he has it neither without generation nor compoundedly, the Son too, like the Father, has all things essentially and without compounding.*

8,8 *And yet it is plain that "like" can never be the same as the thing it is like. For proof < of this we have* > the fact that when the Son of God "was made in the likeness of men"*[54] he became man indeed, but not the same as man in every respect. And when he was made "in the likeness of the flesh of sin"*[55] *he was made with the passions which are the cause of sin in the flesh—I mean hunger, thirst and the rest—but was not made the same as the flesh of sin. Thus the Son's likeness of essence to the Father is also proclaimed by the texts from the apostle.*

9,1 *For as he was made in the likeness of man he was both man, and yet not entirely so—was man in his assumption of human flesh, for "The Word*

---

48 Col 1:16.
49 John 1:14.
50 Prov 9:1.
51 John 5:19.
52 Prov 8:30.
53 John 5:26.
54 Phil 2:7.
55 Rom 8:3.

was made flesh,"[56] *but not man in that he was not begotten of human seed and sexual commerce—*(2) *just so, in that he was the Son of God, he was the Son of God before all ages, just as, in that he was a son of man, he was man. But he is not the same thing as the God and Father who begot him, just as he is not the same thing as man, since [he was begotten] without emission of seed and passion, < just as > [he was made man] without human seed and sexual enjoyment.*

9,3 *And < as he was made > in the likeness of the flesh of sin through being subject to fleshly hunger, thirst and sleep, the passions by which bodies are moved to sin, and yet, though subject to these passions of the flesh, he was not moved to sin by them—*(4) *even so the Son, who was < Son > of God, "in the form of God," and is "equal" to God,*[57] *possessed the attributes of the Godhead in being by nature incorporeal, and like the Father in divinity, incorporeality and activities. As he was "like" the flesh in being flesh and subject to the passions of the flesh,* (5) *and yet was not the same, < so he is "like" God > in the sense that, as God, he is not "the form" of "the God" but the form of "God,"*[58] *and "equal," not to "the God" but to "God." Nor does he < have the Godhead > with full sovereignty like the Father. For as he was not < moved > to sin < tike > a man, and yet behaved tike a man, < so, as God, he behaves "like" the Father* > *, "For whatsoever the Father doeth, the Son also doeth.*[59]

9,6 *Now he was not moved to sin here on earth, but was moved in ways similar to persons in the flesh. (It would be strange if, after passing from his natural state to a state unnatural to him, that is, after becoming a son of man when he had been God, he should become like those to whom this state was natural—that is, who were human by nature—in a trait that was unnatural to him, but [at the same time] not be like his Father by nature in the trait that was natural to him, since he was God begotten of God. And it is plain that those who deny the Son's likeness of essence to the Father do not call him a son either, but only a creature—and do not call the Father a father, but a creator. For the notion of "like" does not entail the Son's identity with the Father, but his likeness of essence to him, and his ineffable sonship to him without passion.)* (7) *For, I say again, as he was not brought to identity with men < by being made > in the likeness of men and of sinful flesh, but, for the reasons given, became like the essence of the flesh, so, by being made*

---

[56] John 1:14.
[57] Phil 2:6.
[58] For the distinction between θεός and ὁ θεός see Lampe, *Lexicon of Patristic Greek*, 643ab.
[59] John 5:19.

like in essence to the Father who begot him, the Son will not bring his essence to identity with the Father, but to likeness to [him].

10,1 *And if, through heeding the wisdom of the world which God has made foolish, anyone fails to heed God's wise declaration and confess with faith the Son's likeness of essence to the Father, for example by giving false names to the Father and the Son and not truly terming them "Father" and "Son" but "creator" and "creature, " equating the concepts of the Father and the Son with the [fatherhood and sonship] of other creatures—and if, from a desire to rationalize, he says that the Son < is superior > [only] in utility as the first of < the > creatures < which have been made > through him, or in the excellence of his greatness, thus confessing none of the church's faith in the Father and the Son, as though to preach by deliberate choice a Gospel different from the Gospel the apostles preached to us, let him be anathema.*

10,2 *And—to repeat the blessed Paul's words, "As we said before, so say I now again"*[60]*—we too must say < in our turn >, If, on hearing that the Father is the only wise God and that his only-begotten Son is his Wisdom, anyone says that the Wisdom is the same as the only wise God and thus denies his sonship, let him be anathema.*

10,3 *And if, on hearing that the Father is the wise God and the Son is his Wisdom, anyone says that the Wisdom is unlike the wise God in essence, and thus denies that the wise God is truly the Father of the Wisdom, let him be anathema.*

10,4 *And if anyone regards the Father as "the God" but< denies > that the Word and "God" in the beginning existed as "God" with "the God" and that, as Word and "God," he was with "the" very "God" himself, with whom he existed as Word and God—and so denies his true sonship—let him be anathema.*

10,5 *And if anyone, on hearing that the only-begotten divine Word is the Son of "the God" with whom the Word and "God" is, says that the Father's divine Word, the "God" who belongs to "the God" and Father, is essentially unlike Him with whom the Only-begotten was at the beginning as [his] divine Word—and so denies his true sonship—let him be anathema.*

10,6 *And if, in denial of his true sonship, anyone, on hearing that the Son is "the image of the invisible God,"*[61] *says that the image is the same as the invisible God, let him be anathema.*

---

[60] Cf. Gal 1:18.
[61] Col 1:15.

10,7 *And if, in true denial of the sonship, anyone, on hearing that the only-begotten Son is "the image of the invisible God," says that, since he is the invisible God's "image," the Son is unlike the invisible God in essence even though the Son is held to be the invisible God's "essential" image, let him be anathema.*

10,8 *And if anyone, on hearing the words of the Son, "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself,"*[62] *says that the Recipient of the life from the Father—he who confessed, "And I live by the Father"*[63]*—is the same as the Giver of the life, let him be anathema.*

10,9 *And if anyone, on hearing "For as the Father hath life in himself, even so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself," says that the Son is essentially unlike the Father even though he affirms that the truth is as the Son has stated it,*[64] *let him be anathema. For plainly, as the life which is held to be in the Father means his essence, and as the life of the Only-begotten, who is begotten of the Father, is held to be his essence, thus the word, "so," denotes the likeness of essence to essence.*

11,1 *And if anyone, on hearing the Son's, "He created me," and, "He begets me,"*[65] *does not take "begets me" literally and as a reference to essence, but says that "He begets me" means the same as "He created me," thus denying that the Son is < designated > by the two terms as the perfect < Son > [begotten] without passion, < but >, < on the basis of these two terms >, confessing that he is a mere creature and not a Son—for Wisdom has conveyed the godly meaning by the two terms—let him be anathema.*

11,2 *And since the Son reveals to us his likeness in essence to the Father through his words, "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself," but his likeness in activity through his teaching, "For what things soever the Father doeth, these also the Son doeth* likewise[66]*—[therefore], if anyone grants him only the likeness of activity but denies the Son his likeness of essence, the cornerstone of our faith, and denies himself eternal life in the knowledge of the Father and the Son, let him be anathema.*

11,3 *And if anyone who professes to believe in a Father and a Son says that the Father is not the Father of an essence like his, but the Father of an activ-*

---

62 John 5:26.
63 John 6:57.
64 Amidon: "insisting that that is in fact what he has said".
65 Prov 8:22; 25.
66 John 5:19.

ity, let him be anathema for daring to utter "profane babblings"[67] *against the essence of the Son of God, and denying the truth of his sonship.*

11,4 *And if anyone who holds that [Christ] is the Son of an essence like his of whom he is held to be the Son, should say that the Son is the same as the Father, or is part of the Father, or that the incorporeal Son originated from the incorporeal Father by emission or passion as corporeal sons do, let him be anathema.*

11,5 *And if anyone who, because the Father is one person and the Son is another, says that the Son differs from the Father since the Father is never conceived of as the Son and the Son is never conceived of as the Father—as the scripture says, "There is another that beareth witness of me,"*[68] *for "The Father that hath sent me beareth witness"*[69]*—[if anyone who says this] because of this godly distinction of the persons of the Father and the Son which is made in the church, fears that the Son may be supposed to be the same as the Father, and therefore says that the Son is unlike the Father in essence, let him be anathema.*

11,6 *And if anyone holds that the Father is the Father of the only-begotten Son in time, and does not believe that the only-begotten Son has originated impassibly from the Father beyond all times and differently from any human thought—thus abandoning the preaching of the apostles, which rejected time with reference to the Father and the Son, but faithfully taught us, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was God,"*[70]*—let him be anathema.*

11,7 *And if anyone says that the Father is prior in time to his only-begotten Son, and that the Son is later in time than the Father, let him be anathema.*

11,8 *And if anyone ascribes the only-begotten Son's timeless origin from the Father to the unbegotten essence of God, and thus speaks of a Son-Father, let him be anathema.*

11,9 *And if anyone says that the Father is < the Father > of the only-begotten Son by authority only, and not the Father of the only-begotten Son by authority and essence alike—thus accepting only the authority, equating the Son with any creature, and denying that he is actually the true Son of the Father—let him be anathema.*

---

[67] Cf. 1 Tim 6:20.
[68] John 5:32.
[69] John 5:37.
[70] John 1:1.

11,10 *And if anyone, though saying that the Father is the Father of the Son by authority and essence, also says that the Son is co-essential, or of identical essence with the Father, let him be anathema.*

11,11 *The signers are Basil, Eustathius, Hyperechius, Letoeus, Heorticus, Gymnasius, Memnonius, Eutyches, Severinus, Eutychius, Alcimides and Alexander. I too believe as the above articles have stated, and confess them with my signature.*

The end of the memorial of Basil, George and his companions

< The Letter of George >

12,1 *It is plain that the term, "being"*[71] *does not appear in the Old and the New Testaments, but the sense of it is to be found, everywhere. In the first place, He who owes his origin to none but is the cause of all things < is implied > by God's words when he sent Moses, "Thus shall thou say unto the children of Israel, 'He Who Is' "*[72]*—< meaning > him who is regarded primarily as the Father "of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named,"*[73] *who has no cause and is the cause of the things that exist.* (2) *Now the Son also "is"; but Paul the Samosatian and Marcellus took advantage of the text in the Gospel according to John, "In the beginning was the Word."*[74] *No longer willing to call the Son of God truly a Son, they took advantage of the term, "Word," I mean verbal expression and utterance, and refused to say "Son of God."* (3) *And so the fathers who tried Paul the Samosatian for this heresy were forced to say that the Son too is a being to show that the Son has reality, subsists, and is, but is not a word, and to distinguish, by means of the term, "being," between a thing which has no existence of its own, and a thing which does.* (4) *For a word has no existence of its own and cannot be a son of God, since if it could, there would be many sons of God.*

For it is agreed that the Father said many things to the Son—When, for instance, he said, "Let there be a firmament,"[75] *"Let there be luminaries,"*[76] *"Let the earth bring forth,"*[77] *and, "Let us make man."*[78] (5) *The Father therefore speaks to the Son, and yet God's words, which he says to the Son, are not sons. The Son to whom the Father speaks, however, may with piety*

---

[71] οὐσία. In the Letter of George it is more convenient to use this rendering than "essence."

[72] Exod 3:14. Cf. Eus. Eccl. Theol. 2.20.15; Ath. Dec. Nic. Syn. 22.3; Or. IV 26.

[73] Eph 3:15.

[74] John 1:1.

[75] Gen 1:6.

[76] Gen 1:4.

[77] Gen 1:24.

[78] Gen 1:26.

be called, among other things, "bread," "life," and "resurrection"; and he is further termed, "Word," since he is the interpreter of the counsels of God.

12,6 *And therefore lest, to deceive the simple, the heretics should say that the Son is the same as the words which are spoken by God, the fathers, as I say, called the Son a "being" to show the difference between the Son of God and the words of God. They expressed the distinction in this way because God "is," and the words which he speaks < "are" >, and yet they are not God's "beings" but his verbal operations. But although the Son is a Word, he is not God's verbal operation; he is a "being" since he is a Son.* (7) *For if the Father "is" the Son also < "is" >; but the Son "is" in such a way that,* (8) *since he has his being from God by true sonship, he will not be regarded as a Word like the words God speaks. They have their being in the Speaker; but he has his in virtue of his begetting by the Father, his hearing of the Father, and his service to the Father. The fathers, then, called this entity a "being."*

13,1 *We regard the Son as like the Father in all respects, in opposition to the party that is now growing up as an excrescence on the church.* (2) *This current faction declares that the Son is like the Father in will and activity, but that the Son is unlike the Father in < being >.* (3) *Thus it is the contention of these new sectarians that the will of the Son and the activity of the Son are like the will of the Father and the activity of the Father, but that the Son himself is unlike the Father. And they agree that the Son's will and activity are like the Father's will and activity, but the reason they will not allow that the Son is like the Father is that they maintain that the Son is not begotten of God. He is merely a creature, and differs from the other creatures in that he surpasses them in greatness and came into being before them all, and that God availed himself of his assistance in the creation of the rest.* (4) *Because, say the sectarians, God made the rest through a Son, but made him by no one's instrumentality but personally, and made him superior in greatness and might to all things, God called him an "only-begotten Son."*

14,1 *We of the catholic church, however, have taken our confession of faith from the sacred scriptures, and hold as follows. The Father is the Father of a Son like himself, and the Son is like the Father of whom he is held to be the Son.* (2) *Defining this further, and thus narrowing the sense of it as against the Sabellians and the rest, we hold that the Son cannot be a Father, or the Father a Son.* (3) *(The accurate knowledge of the Persons consists of the following: The Father, who is everlastingly a Father, is incorporeal and immortal, while the Son, who is everlastingly a Son and never a Father, but is called everlasting because of his being's independence of time and incomprehensibility, has taken flesh by the will of the Father, and has undergone death for us.)*

14,4 *Despite the clarity of these distinctions, the strange people who support this sect exert themselves in an effort to achieve two aims. One is never again to say "Father and Son," but "Ingenerate and Generate"; for in this way they hope to foist the sophistry of their sect on the church.* (5) *For those who are wise in the things of God understand that "Ingenerate" < plainly > means less than the term, "Father." Since "ingenerate" means [only] that a thing has not been generated, it does not yet say whether it is also a father—for the term, "father," means more than the term, "ingenerate."* (6) *As I say, "ingenerate" does not carry the connotation of fatherhood, but "father" connotes, both that the father is not a son—provided that he is understood as a "father" in the proper sense of the word—and that he is the cause of a son like himself.*

14,7 *This is one aim. Besides, they were the first to portray the Son as unlike the Father in essence, since they supposed, from something they had unearthed in a letter by the venerable bishop Hosius in which the essential unlikeness is mentioned,*[79] *that the church had affirmed it.* (8) *However, since the easterners who came to Sirmium last year*[80] *exposed this sect's sharp practice, they tried their best, in order to escape punishment for their assaults on the church's faith, to remove the term, "being" which was used by the fathers, from the church's teaching for these reasons, as another way of lending apparent strength to their sect.*

15,1 *For they supposed that, if the word, "being," were rejected, they could say that the Son is like the Father only in will and activity, and gain the right to say, finally, that since "being" was not mentioned, the Son is unlike the Father in being and existence.* (2) *But God, the vindicator of the truth who "taketh the wise in their own craftiness,"*[81] *openly declared, through the mouth of the pious emperor, that his Only-begotten's relation to himself is the Son's likeness to him in all respects.* (3) *For this was the emperor's own view, in his piety, of God's only-begotten Son who fought for him. And since this was his belief he declared with pious lips that the Son is like the Father in all respects, as the catholics believe; and that it was not by his doing that this proceeding against the church's faith had been launched, the aim of which*

---

[79] Hosius of Cordova signed the creed of the Second Council of Sirmium, AD 357. This creed repudiates both the homoousion and the homoeousion, because they are not in scripture and the manner of the Son's generation cannot be known. It does not mention in so many words the doctrine of the Son's unlikeness to the Father.

[80] I.e., 358 AD.

[81] 1 Cor 3:19.

was to eliminate the term, "being" so that, with "being" no longer on men's lips, the heresy might make its lair in their hearts.

15,4 *But let us anticipate them, since they describe [the Son] as like [the Father] in will but unlike him in essence. If, indeed, they candidly and plainly admit his likeness in all things to the Father, the worthlessness of their anxious effort to remove the word, "being," will be exposed.* (5) *For they gained nothing since they were compelled to confess that the Son is like the Father in all respects. For if he is like in all respects, as they have confessed him to be—and it is in this way that the Son is like the Father—he is like, not just in will and operation—the distinction they draw—but in existence, subsistence and being as a son should be.*

And once for all, < the phrase >, "in all respects," is all-inclusive and leaves no room for distinction. (6) *This—if it be admitted that the Father himself is not "like" himself, and the Son himself is not "like" himself, but is instead a Son who is like his Father; and that, since he is in all respects like the Father, he is not a Father but a Son—[this] provides us with a worthy conception of the Father through our contemplation of him.* (7) *For the Son was begotten of this Father, Perfect begotten of Perfect, begotten in the Father's likeness*[82] *before anyone can conceive and, before all reckonings, times and ages—as only the Father knows, who begot the Son of himself without passion; and the Son, who has his being from him; and he to whom the Son will reveal him.*

16,1 *And the word, "hypostases," need trouble no one. The easterners say "hypostases" as an acknowledgment of the subsistent, real individualities of the persons.* (2) *For if the Father is spirit, the Son is spirit, and the Holy Ghost is spirit, < but > "the Son" does not mean "Father"—and since there is also a "Spirit," and this does not mean "Son," and he is not the Son—and since the Holy Spirit cannot be the Father or the Son, but is a Holy Spirit given to the faithful by the Father through the Son—and since, in all probability, the Holy Spirit too subsists and is real—the easterners, as I said, call the individualities of the subsistent Persons "hypostases." They do not mean that the three hypostases are three first principles, or three Gods, for they condemn anyone who speaks of three Gods.* (3) *Nor do they call the Father and the Son two Gods; they confess that the Godhead is one, and that it encompasses all things through the Son, in the Holy Spirit.*

16,4 *< But > though they confess one Godhead, dominion and first principle, they still acknowledge the Persons in an orthodox manner through the individualities of the hypostases. They perceive the Father as subsistent in*

[82] Holl καθ' ὁμοιότητα; MSS ὁμοιότητος, "of the Father's likeness," is not possible.

his paternal authority and confess the Son, not as a part of the Father, but as a perfect Son plainly begotten without blemish of a perfect Father. And they acknowledge that the Holy Spirit, whom the sacred scripture calls the Paraclete, owes his being to the Father through the Son. (5) *< For > as the Paraclete, the Spirit of truth, teaches us the truth, which is the Son—No man can say, Jesus is Lord, but by the Holy Spirit"*[83]*—so the Son, who is truth, teaches the godly knowledge of the true God, his Father, as he says, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."*[84] (6) *In the Holy Spirit, then, we have a godly apprehension of the Son; but in the only-begotten Son we piously and worthily glorify the Father. And this is the seal of the faith, the seal with which our Savior and Lord, Jesus Christ, who said, "Go make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit,"*[85] *commanded us to be baptized.*

17,1 *The Son's likeness in all respects to the Father has been more extensively discussed elsewhere. Even now, however, I do not mind noting briefly in passing that the apostle, who called the Son "the image of the invisible God"*[86] *and in this way taught us that the Son is like the Father, has told us in other passages how we are to conceive of the Son.* (2) *In the Epistle to the Philippians he says, "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men;"*[87] *and in the Epistle to the Romans,* (3) *"For what the Law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending his own Son in the likeness of flesh, and for sin, condemned sin the flesh."*[88]

Thus, through the two passages from the two Epistles, we are also taught, through physical examples, the orthodox notion of likeness as it applies to the incorporeal Father and Son. (4) *The words, "took upon him the form of a servant and was made in likeness of men," show that the Son took flesh from the Virgin. Therefore the flesh which the Son of God took is the same as human flesh. But it is "in the likeness" of men, since it was not generated from seed, as men are, or by commerce with a man.* (5) *Similarly the Son, who is spirit and begotten of the Father as spirit, is the same as the Father in that he is spirit begotten of spirit, just as he is < the same as men > in that he*

---

[83] 1 Cor 12:3.
[84] John 14:9.
[85] Matt 28:19.
[86] Col 1:15.
[87] Phil 2:6–7.
[88] Rom 8:3.

is flesh born of Mary's flesh. But in that he is begotten of the Father without emanation, passion and division, he is "like" the Father, and yet not < the Father > himself—< just as > the fleshly Son is in the "likeness" of men, and yet not himself man in all respects.

18,1 *Through the Epistle to the Philippians, then, Paul has taught us how the hypostasis of the Son is like the hypostasis of the Father. For the Son is spirit, [begotten] of the Father, and, as far as the meaning of "spirit" goes, the same as he—just as he is the same [as man] as far as the meaning of "flesh" goes. And yet he is not the same but like, since "spirit," which the Son is, is not the Father, and the flesh the Word assumed has not originated from human seed and through pleasure, but as the Gospel has taught us.*

18,2 *As I have said, the Son has taught us through Philippians how the Son is entirely like the Father in his being and subsistence.* (3) *But how he is like him in his will, activity and operations he has taught us through Romans, with the words, "In the likeness of the flesh of sin he condemned sin in the flesh."*[89] *The flesh which the Son of God assumed was the same as the flesh of sin, and was likewise moved to hunger, thirst and sleep like all flesh, but was not moved to sin by them.* (4) *This is why scripture says, "in the 'likeness' of the flesh of sin," an expression similar to, "What things soever the Father doeth, the same doeth the Son in like manner."*[90] *For the Father, who is spirit, acts on his own authority; the Son, though spirit, does not act on his own authority like the Father, but acts "in like manner."*

18,5 *Therefore, insofar as all flesh is the same, he is the same—just as, insofar as all spirit is the same, he is the same. But insofar as [his flesh was conceived] without seed, he is not the same [as flesh] but like it, just as, insofar as he was begotten, [though] without emission and passion, he is not the same [as the Father], but like him. And he is the same as flesh insofar as all flesh is the same, just as he is the same as spirit insofar as all spirit is the same. But insofar as he is in the likeness of sinful flesh, he is like in the impulses of the flesh and yet not the same, just as the Son [acts, but] in a subordinate role in the likeness of the [Father's] action, and not in the same way that the Father acts, with full sovereignty.* (6) *From these considerations it is evident that the Son is like the Father in all respects, as a son is like his father if he is legitimately begotten of him.*

For it would be absurd for Him who was God's Son before all ages, and who was by nature God of God the Father, to become like those who were

[89] Rom 8:3.
[90] John 5:19.

men by nature, in a way unnatural to him, when he was made man of Mary, contrary to nature—(since he was God, it was not natural for him to become man)—and yet for him not to be like the Father who begot him in a way that was natural to him. (7) *If he, unnaturally, is like those who are men by nature, all the more is he by nature like the Father who begot him legitimately in accordance with his nature. It is thus in keeping with the scriptures that the doctrine of the Son's likeness to the Father in all respects be added to the scriptures. < But > he is like him, < and > has been understood < by us > [to be like him] in the senses in which the apostle has taught us the notion of "likeness" through the above passages.* (8) *For he is also like [the Father] in that he is life of life, light of light, very God of very God, and wisdom of the wise God. And in a word, according to the scriptures he is not like [the Father] merely in activity and will. In his very being, subsistence and actuality, he is in all respects like the Father who begot him—-as a son is like a father.*

19,1 *If the new sectarians go on to dispute with us and speak of "ingenerate" and "generate," we shall tell them, "You have disingenuously refused to accept the word, 'being,' although it was used by the fathers, because it is unscriptural. Neither will we accept the word, 'ingenerate,' since it is unscriptural. The apostle says, 'incorruptible,' 'invisible,' 'immortal,' but scripture has never called God 'ingenerate.'"*

19,2 *Then, as I have already said, "ingenerate" does not yet mean "Father." And in itself, "generate" does not yet mean "Son," but applies the meaning equally to all things that have origins. (For if one says "generate," he has indicated that the thing had an origin, but has nowhere given indication of One who must forever be regarded as a Son. We, therefore, who forever regard him as the Son of God, shall not accept this term.)*

19,3 *< But > besides, the phrase, "Father and Son," denotes a relation to something. Thus even if we name only a "father," we have the notion of "son" included in the term, "father," for "father" means the father of a son. < And > even though we name only a "son," we have the notion of the "father," for "son" means the son of a father.* (4) *Each is linked with the other, and the connection cannot be broken. Indeed, either of them mentioned alone implies the notion of the other—and not only the name, but with the name, the natural relationship.* (5) *In understanding God to be a Father, we understand him to be the Father of God. And in understanding a Son of God to be God, we also understand the said Son of God to be of like nature with Him whose Son he is understood to be. But "ingenerate" does not mean "the ingenerate father of a generate son", nor does "generate" mean "generate son of an ingenerate father."*

20,1 *The terms "ingenerate" and "generate," then, do not imply a relationship between the ingenerate and the generate, or, at the same time, give indication of their nature. Instead they put the individuality of the Son on a level with the rest of created things. Therefore, because of the impious trickery, we shall not accept the terms, but shall persist in our holy use of "Father and Son."*

20,2 *In the first place, we who were called from the gentiles were not baptized in the name of an Ingenerate and a Generate, but of a Father and a Son. And then, the Son is nowhere found to have called his Father "Ingenerate," but to have always called God, "Father," and himself, "Son of God."* (3) *To mention a few examples in passing we hear him say, "If ye loved me, ye would rejoice because I go unto my Father";*[91] *"Are ye angry with me, whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, because I said, I am the Son of God?"*[92] *"I proceeded forth from the Father and am come. I came forth from the Father and am come into the world. Again, I leave the world and go unto the Father."*[93] *And Peter's confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of God.*[94] *And the Father says from on high, "This is my beloved Son."*[95]

20,4 *And therefore, since the Father thus refers to the Son and the Son to the Father, and we—to say it once more—were baptized in these names, we shall always use them, and reject the "profane innovations"*[96] *against the apostolic faith.* (5) *For the words of the Father, "By the splendors of the saints, from the belly, before the morning star begot I thee,"*[97] *are spoken perforce, and will withdraw the Son from the category of creatures; for by the term which corresponds to the term, "belly," (i.e., "beget") the Father teaches us of the Son he has legitimately begotten as his own.* (6) *And when the Son likewise said "The Lord created me,"*[98] *to < keep us from > supposing that his nature is in the same category as the other, created things," he perforce added, "Before all hills he begets me,"*[99] *providing us with the notion of his sonship to God the Father that is a godly one and implies no passion.* (7) *However, the Father has expounded "generate" to us once, and the Son*

---

91 John 14:28.
92 John 10:36.
93 John 16:28 combined with 8:42.
94 Matt 16:16.
95 Matt 17:5.
96 Cf. Tim 6:20.
97 Ps 109:3.
98 Prov 8:22.
99 Cf. Prov 8:25.

once, because of the Son's godly filiation. But the entire New Testament is full of the words, "Father," and, "Son."

21,1 *But so that the coiners of this heresy may be known by their own words, I note in passing a few examples of the many things they have written on the subject—[no more than a few,] because of their length. From these, I presume, the catholics must surely understand the full purport of their heresy, and make the decision that those who have written these things must abjure them, and to expel both them and their doctrines from the apostolic faith, as well as condemning those who believe and teach the same as they. For they write as follows, in these very words:*

21,2 *"Most of all I am eager to convey to you, in brief compass, some of the finest, God-inspired words. Any who suppose that the Son has a likeness of essence to the Father have departed from the truth, for with the title, 'generate,' they impeach the likeness of essence."*[100]

21,3 *And again, they say, "The Son both is and is admitted to be inferior < to the Ingenerate because of his > generation. He therefore cannot have likeness of essence to the Ingenerate, but does have the likeness by upholding the will of God, unaltered, in his own person. He has a likeness, then—not a likeness of essence but a likeness in respect of will, < for God > brought < him > into being as he willed."*

And again, "Why do you yourself not agree with me that the Son is not like the Father in essence?"

Further, (4) *"When it is admitted that the Son is everlasting although he does not have life of his own nature but by the authority of the Ingenerate; but it is also admitted that ingenerate nature endlessly transcends all authority; why is it < not > plain that the impious are exchanging the godly doctrine of the heteroousion for 'likeness of essence?' "*

21,5 *And again, "Therefore the word, 'Father,' is not indicative of essence, but of the authority which brought the Son into being before all ages as the divine Word, everlastingly < in possession > of the essence and authority which have been given him, and which he continues to possess."*

21,6 *And again, "< If > they maintain that 'Father' denotes essence but not authority, they should also call the person of the Only-begotten, 'Father.' "*

22,1 *We shall now say to the present day sectarians, "You have written, 'Like in will, unlike in essence.' We have therefore written in reply, 'Like, not merely by imitation, but in essence as well.'* (2) *You, then, were the first to*

---

[100] I.e., If the Father is "ingenerate" the Son must be "generate." Therefore they cannot be of like essence.

mention essence, when you said 'unlikeness in essence'; and you are eager for the elimination of the word, 'essence,' so that you can say that the Son is like the Father only in will. (3) *Therefore, if you really agree that the Son is in all respects like the Father, condemn those who speak of a distinction in likeness, and write as follows: 'If anyone denies that the Son is like the Father just as [any] son is like his father, but says that he is like him only in will and unlike him in essence, let him be anathema.'"* (4) *And if they choose < not > to mention the word, "essence," after that, and repudiate even their own signatures by making < no > mention at all of "essence," they should still confess the faith of the fathers that the Son is like < the > Father not only in will, but in essence, subsistence and actuality—in a word, in everything as a son is like his father, as the sacred scriptures say."*

22,5 *The signatories of the statement of faith*[101] *in the Son's likeness to the Father in all respects were the following:*

Mark, bishop of Arethusia. I so believe and hold, and < I >, and all here present < am in agreement > with the foregoing.

But Valens subscribed as follows. All here present, and the godly emperor before whom I have testified both orally and in writing know how I have affixed the above signature on the night before Pentecost.

22,6 *But after this Valens signed the document in his own way. To his signature he added a statement that the Son is like the Father, but without adding, "in all respects," and making it clear in what sense he agreed with the above, or how he understood "co-essential." The godly emperor pointed this out and compelled him to add, "in all respects," which he did.*

But Basil suspected that he had added even "in all respects" in a sense of his own[102] *to the copies < which > Valens was anxious to obtain, to take to the council at Ariminum.*[103] So he subscribed as follows:

22,7 *Basil, bishop of Ancyra. I < so > believe. And I assent to the foregoing by confessing that the Son is like the Father in all respects. But in all! Not merely in will, but, as the sacred scriptures teach, in subsistence, actuality and essence, as a son is. [I believe that he is] spirit of spirit, life of life, light of light, God of God, very Son of very < Father >; the Son, who is Wisdom, of a*

---

[101] The creed of the fourth Council of Sirmium, May 22, 359 AD, concludes, "The word, 'essence' . . . gives scandal, as the scriptures do not contain it. It is our pleasure that it be removed . . . But we affirm that the Son is like the Father in all respects, as the scriptures say and teach." Hahn pp. 204–5; (Ath. Syn. 8.70; Soc. 2.37; Nic. H. E. 9.30).

[102] Amidon and MSS: τῷ ἰδίῳ νῷ; MSS: <μὴ> τῷ ἰδίῳ νῷ.

[103] The creed of the Council of Ariminum, 359 AD, was a compromise formula which said, ". . . like the Father, the Begetter, according to the scriptures, whose origin no one knows save the Father, who alone begot him . . ." Hahn p. 208 (Jer. C. Luc. 17).

wise God and Father. And in a word, [I confess] that the Son is like the Father in all respects, as a son is like a father. (8) *And as has been stated above, if anyone says that the Son is like the Father [only] in a particular way, he is untrue to the catholic church, since he is not saying that the Son is like the Father in accordance with the sacred scriptures.*

The postscript was read and given to Valens in the presence of the bishops Mark, George, Ursacius, Germanus and Hypatian, and a larger number of presbyters and deacons.

23,1 I have inserted these letters to show all studious persons who are in search of the truths of the faith that I do not accuse people without reason, but do my best to base what I say on reliable evidence.

23,2 In turn, the Semi-Arians fell out with their allies; and they quarreled with each other and competed for leadership because of the grudges of some of them, and from common jealousy of each other and the desire to rule. And at that time the party of these Semi-Arians—I mean Basil, George, Silvanus and the rest of them—were in the ascendent. But < the others* >—Eudoxius, George of Alexandria, and Euzoeus of Antioch—< opposed them* >, and had on their side an arm of flesh, the emperor Constantius. (3) And in spite of their great influence the party of Basil and George of Laodicea were humiliated.[104] Still others of them broke with this faction and confederacy, and the Arian movement was divided into three groups. (4) For because of his envy and hatred of Cyril of Jerusalem, this same Acacius of Caesarea in Palestine, along with Melitius, Uranius of Tyre, and Eutychius of Eleutheropolis opposed Basil, George of Laodicea, Silvanus of Tarsus, Eleusius of Cyzicus, Macedonius of Constantinople, Eustathius of Sebaste and the newly consecrated bishop of Antioch, Anianus. < And > by ranging himself against them, Acacius caused a great deal of confusion.

23,5 [All of] these people, in fact, were of the same opinion, but were divided; because they each confessed it differently they differed, and were separated into the three factions I have indicated. (6) For although they were the same as the others, Acacius and his allies would neither confess the homoousion, nor say that Christ is a creature < like > any other creature. While < they > kept quiet about the word, "creature," because of the times, they were entirely like < the > Arians. But at that time they concealed the fact that they believed no differently than these, because

[104] Basil, along with Eustathius of Sebaste and Cyril of Jerusalem, was deprived of his see at the synod held at Constantinople in 360.

of the admixture with them of people who were really orthodox, but were hypocrites and practiced hypocrisy for fear of the emperor's right arm.

And what with their mutual hatred, < they could not > stand firm even though they wanted to. (7) For from enmity towards Cyril, Eutychius of Eleutheropolis became one of Acacius' supporters, since he had learned the plain creed of orthodoxy from the blessed Maximon, the confessor bishop of Jerusalem. He was orthodox for a while, but dissembled to keep his see, as did many other Palestinian bishops. (8) For their sakes Acacius and his friends, though they were infected with the same madness and insane heresy, did not agitate these issues for the time being, and < did not dare > either to confess or to deny < the homoousion >. But at the Emperor Constantius' command they met at the town in Isauria called Rugged Seleucia and issued another creed, if you please[105]—a creed not in agreement with the one the fathers had drawn up in the city of Nicaea, which was orthodox and well drawn. Instead, they said with feigned simplicity, (24,1) *We believe in one God the Father almighty,* and next simply, *And [we believe] in the Son of God*, without saying anything of weight about him.[106] But later, to give a glimpse of their device, they said, *We reject the homoousion as untrue to sacred scripture, but condemn the doctrine of the Son's unlikeness to the Father.*

24,2 And this was the lure of crafty hunters. In fact, when they were by themselves they would assert and teach that the Son of God is a creature, but that he is "like" the Father in the common understanding of the term. (3) For even sculptors create images and produce likenesses, of gold, silver and other materials or of paint on wood, and they have the likeness of their models, but nothing to equal them. And so their strategy was to confess that the Son is "like" the Father, but without one bit of the Father's Godhead.

24,4 Some of their supporters accepted this < with hesitation* >, but still accepted it because of the misfortune of the time that had befallen them; and at the same time most knew what they were doing, though some were indeed in ignorance, as was shown later. For Patrophilus of Scythopolis was on their side, and after him Philip, who was consecrated there as his successor, and many others who really held this heresy. (5) Now, however,

---

105 The Council of Seleucia was held in 359 by the eastern bishops, while the western bishops were holding the Council of Ariminum. For its creed see below at 25,6.

106 The creed of Seleucia in fact reads, "And we also believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, his Son, who was begotten of him . . ." etc. Epiphanius is either misinformed, or tendentious, at this point.

after their deaths, when their heresy has become widespread and they are free to speak because of the arm of flesh, they are stating their thesis plainly with no further hindrance, and are no longer restrained by any shame, or pretending because of an emperor's order. (6) <But> lest it be thought that I am attacking them for no good reason, I shall here give the creed which was issued there by Acacius' faction themselves, over the signature of the participants in the council. It is as follows:

(The Synodical Letter of Seleucia)[107]

25,1 *The bishops who have assembled at Seleucia in Isauria from various provinces at the command of his Reverence, our most God-fearing emperor Constantius. We, who have assembled at Seleucia in Isauria by the will of the emperor, have passed the following resolution:*

25,2 *Yesterday, the fifth before the Kalends of October, we made every effort, with all decorum, to preserve the peace of the church and, as our emperor Constantius, the most beloved of God, commanded us, produce a sound statement <of> the faith in the words of the prophets <and Gospels>, and add nothing contrary to the sacred scriptures to the creed of the church.*

25,3 *But certain persons abused some of us at the council, silenced others and did not permit them to speak, locked some out against their will, were accompanied by deposed clerics from various provinces, and brought with them persons who had been uncanonically ordained. The session thus became full of clamor on every side, as the most illustrious count Leonas, and Lauridus, the most illustrious governor of the province, saw with their own eyes. Therefore we assert that we do not abandon the genuine creed < which was put forth > at the Dedication at Antioch, but bring <it> forward. This is the main reason the fathers themselves came together at that time, the one which underlies the question.*

25,4 *< But > since the doctrines of the homoousion and homoeousion have troubled many in the past and do today, and it is further said that the novel doctrine of the Son's unlikeness to the Father is even now taught by some, we reject the homoousion as untrue to the scriptures, but condemn the doctrine of the unlikeness, and regard all who hold it as strangers to the church.* (5)

---

[107] This is the encyclical issued by the Council of Seleucia September 27, 359, and represents the thinking of the Acacians. It is also found at Ath. Syn. 29.3–9; Soc. 2.40.8–17.

However, like the apostle who said, "He is the image of the invisible God,"[108] *we plainly confess the likeness of the Son to the Father.*

25,6[109] *We confess and believe in one God, the Father almighty, maker of heaven and earth, things visible and invisible.*

25,7 *And we believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of him without passion before all ages, the divine Word, only-begotten God of God, light, life, truth, wisdom, power, by whom all things were made, things in heaven and things on earth, whether visible or invisible.* (8) *We believe that, to take away sin, he took flesh of the holy Virgin at the close of the ages and was made man. He suffered for our sins, rose again, was taken up into heaven, is seated at the right hand of the Father, and will come again with glory to judge the quick and the dead.*

25,9 *And we believe also in one Holy Spirit, whom our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ also termed the Paraclete, and whom he promised to send to the disciples after his ascension; and he sent him, and through him sanctifies the believers in the church, who are baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.*

The catholic church knows that those who preach anything other than this creed are not her own.

25,10 *The readers will recognize that the creed formerly issued at Sirmium*[110] *in the presence of his Reverence, our emperor, is of a meaning equivalent to this.*

Those who are here have signed this creed: Basil, Mark, George the bishop of Alexandria, Pancratius, Hypatian, and most of the bishops of the west.

I, George, bishop of Alexandria, have issued this creed. My profession is as it is set forth here.

I, Acacius, bishop of Caesarea, have issued this creed. My profession is as it is set forth here. Uranius, bishop of Tyre, Eutychius, bishop of Eleutheropolis, Zoilus, bishop of Larissa in Syria, Seras, bishop of Paraetonium in Libya, Paul, bishop of Emisa, Eustathius, bishop of Epiphania, Irenaeus, bishop of Tripoli in Phoenicia, Eusebius, bishop of Seleucia in Syria, Eutychianus, bishop of Patara in Lyda, Eustathius, bishop of Pinari and Sidymi, Basil, bishop of Kaunia in Lydia, Peter, bishop of Hyppus in Palestine, Stephen, bishop of Ptolemais in Libya, Eudoxius, bishop of . . . Apollonius, bishop of Oxyrynchus, Theoctistus, bishop of Ostradne, Leontius, bishop of < Tripoli

[108] Col 1:15.
[109] Hahn pp. 206–208.
[110] I.e., the creed of the Second Council of Sirmium, issued in 351.

in > Lydia, Theodosius, bishop of Philadelphia in Lydia, Phoebus, bishop of Polychalandus in Lydia, Magnus, bishop of Themisi in Phrygia, Evagrius, bishop of Mitylene of the islands, Cyrion, bishop of Doliche, Augustus, bishop of Euphrates, Polydeuces, bishop . . . of the second province of Libya, Pancras, bishop of Pelusium, (7) Phillocadus, bishop of Augustus in the province of Phrygia, Serapion, bishop of Antipyrgus in Libya, Eusebius, bishop of Sebaste in Palestine, Heliodorus, bishop of Sozusa in Pentapolis, Ptolemais, bishop of Thmuis in Augustamnica, (8) Abgar, bishop of Cyrus in Euphrasia, Exeresius, bishop of Gerasa, Arabio, bishop of Adrai, Charisius, bishop of Azotus, Elisha, bishop of Diocletianopolis, Germanus, bishop of Petra, Baruch, bishop of Arabia; forty-three bishops in all.[111] So far the document issued by the above-mentioned Semi-Arians and Arians.

27,1 You men of sense who have gone through this and the other creeds, be aware that the effort of both parties is a fraud and nothing orthodox, with even a bit of the godly confession of faith. (2) For the Lord says, "What ye have heard in the ear, that proclaim ye upon the housetops."[112] And as the holy apostle says, "Speak every man truth with his neighbor";[113] but the prophet speaks out to expose their mischief, "He speaketh peace with his neighbor, but in his heart hath he war."[114] (3) In the same way, when these followers of Acacius wanted to cast off the restraint of the true confession after their separation from Basil and his adherents, they issued a spurious, easily refutable, and entirely misleading creed, so that, if they wanted to fool people, they could make a proper confession in the words we have given—(4) but if they chose to reveal the banefulness of their heresy they would have this declaration available, which is midway between the two positions and possible as a confession of each of their creations.

27,5 But since, in this Acacian faction which was separated from the other two—I have said that the Arian party was divided into three groups. Eudoxius, Germanus, George of Alexandria and Euzoeus of Antioch made one division, (6) and similarly Eleusius, Eustathius, George of Laodicea, Silvanus of Tarsus, Macedonius of Constantinople and many others made another. (7) But again Acacius, as I said, Melitius, Eutychius and certain others formed another group of their own. And the whole thing was pure trickery. (8) What each of them believed, the other believed. But they were divided into schisms among themselves, either from mutual hatred,

---

111 The list contains 37 names; some have fallen out.
112 Matt 10:27.
113 Eph 4:25.
114 Ps 27:3.

since Cyril of Jerusalem was furious with Eutychius and Eutychius with Cyril, but Cyril was in with Basil of Galate, Anianus the newly consecrated bishop of Antioch, and George of Laodicea—(9) but why wear myself out distinguishing between the factions and describing them? I shall go on to the counter-arguments, and the refutation of the guile of each of them. First, though, I must speak of what happened later, for this contributed to the goodness of some, and the wickedness of others.

28,1 For when Melitius was consecrated at Antioch by Acacius' faction—and for Acacius this has been the beginning of his retreat, if only slightly, from his heretical views. By his support of Melitius' election he shows that, of all things, he is in the orthodox camp. As I was saying, when Melitius was consecrated by Acacius' own friends they thought he shared their opinion. But as many report of him, he turned out not to. (2) For at present, since Melitius has been hounded and expelled from his see, those who favor him and his party are gradually and progressively becoming orthodox for God's sake, due to the protracted length of the banishment. (3) For there were more [orthodox] laity than there were laity of the <other*> party.[115] They profess their faith in the Son admirably through their episcopal elections, and do not reject the homoousion. Indeed they are prepared to confess and not deny it, they say, if there can just be a last council. (4) In fact the most honorable Melitius himself, who was consecrated at Antioch by the Arians around Melitius, gave a sort of first installment of this in church, in his first sermon at Antioch, and in orthodox terms, or so say the majority. I offer his sermon here, as follows:

A Copy of Melitius' Sermon[116]

29,1 *The most wise Ecclesiastes says, "The end of any speaking is better than its beginning."*[117] *How much better and safer is it to cease from a struggle over words than to begin one, especially as the same Ecclesiastes says, "This wisdom of the poor is set at naught, and his words are not heard."*[118] (2) < *But* > *since "The body is not one member, but many,"*[119] *"All the members care one*

[115] Holl: τοῦ τῆς <ἄλλης> συνόδου; MSS: τοῦ τῆς συνόδοὺ.

[116] This sermon appears to be referred to at Theodoret H. E. 2.31.8, where, however, Melitius speaks at a sort of public debate before the emperor.

[117] Eccles 7:8.

[118] Eccles 9:16.

[119] 1 Cor 12:14.

for another that there be no schism in the body,"[120] *and "The head cannot say to the feet, I have no need of you,"*[121] *but "God hath tempered the body together, giving the more abundant honor to the part which lacks,"*[122] *it goes without saying that one cannot avoid being troubled by the troubling of the whole body.*

29,3 *But how should one begin to speak to you? Plainly, it is fitting that whoever embarks on speech or action should make peace its beginning and end, and that those who begin with it should also close with it. "For this shall turn to your salvation," says the apostle, "through your prayer and the supply of the Spirit"*[123] *which Jesus gives to those who believe in him.* (4) *And whether one speaks words of edification, "consolation, comfort of love, or fellowship of the Spirit,"*[124] *he comes in the peace of God—not, indeed, for all without discrimination, but peace "for those who love the Law,"*[125] *as the prophet says. Not the written Law, the "image and shadow of things to come,"*[126] *but the spiritual law which wisely reveals the outcome of the things that were foretold.* (5) *"For peace," says the scripture, "is multiplied to them that love thee, and they have none occasion of stumbling."*[127]

Plainly, for those who hate peace, the occasion of stumbling remains, and it behooves those who long to be free from them to hold the love of the Lord before them as a shield. "For he himself is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition, the enmity of the flesh, the Law of commandments contained in ordinances."[128] (6) *Nor is it possible to keep the commandment of the Lord without a prior love of God—for "If ye love me," says Christ, "keep my commandments."*[129] *Nor can the eyes or heart be enlightened unless the commandment enlightens them, for the scripture says, "The commandment of the Lord is clear, and giveth light unto the eyes."*[130] *Nor can one speak any truth unless he has Christ within him as the Speaker, in the words of him who says, "since ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in me"*[131]*—or rather, not simply "speaking in me," but,*

---

120 1 Cor 12:25.
121 1 Cor 12:21.
122 1 Cor 12:24.
123 Phil 1:19.
124 Cf. Phil 2:1.
125 Cf. Ps 118:165.
126 Cf Heb 8:15; 10:1.
127 Ps 118:165.
128 Eph 2:14–15.
129 John 14:15.
130 Ps 18:9.
131 2 Cor 13:3.

"having mercy in me." (7) *"Let thy mercy and thy salvation come upon me," says the scripture, "and I shall make answer unto them that rebuke me,"*[132] *though this cannot be unless one "seek his statutes."*[133] *For those who are not so disposed, < or > apparently so, there is shame in his rebukes, and they cannot say, "Take from me shame and rebuke."*[134] *Instead the word of truth is taken out of his mouth, so that there is nothing more for him who prays < than >, "Take not the word of thy truth out of my mouth."*[135]

30,1 *And when is this? When < one > does not continually observe the Law—when one does not journey on open ground. For one's "heart must be broadened"*[136] *if one is to have room for the Christ who "walks within him,"*[137] *whose glory, not men but the heavens declare, for "The heavens declare the glory of God"*[138]*—or rather, the Father himself declares by saying, "This is my Son, the beloved, in whom I am well pleased."*[139] (2) *But one cannot confess this [Son] "if he haughtily speaketh iniquity"*[140] *to his neighbor, if he joins the band of the antichrists and adopts*[141] *their name, abandoning the band and name of the Christians, of whom it is said, "Touch not mine anointed ones."*[142] (3) *For "Who is a liar," the scripture asks, "save he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? This," it says, "is the antichrist. For whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: but he that acknowledgeth the Son acknowledged the Father also. That which ye have heard from the beginning," it says, "let this abide in you. And if that abideth in you which ye have heard from the beginning ye also shall abide in the Son and in the Father."*[143]

30,4 *But we shall "abide" when we confess before God and his elect angels—indeed, confess before kings, and not be ashamed, for the scripture says, "I have spoken of thy testimonies before kings and was not ashamed."*[144] *[We shall abide when we confess] that the Son of God is God of God, One of One, Only-begotten of Ingenerate, the elect Offspring of his Begetter and a Son worthy of him who has no beginning; the ineffable Interpreter of the*

---

132 Ps 118:41–42.
133 Ps 118:56; 94; 145; 155.
134 Cf. Ps 118:22.
135 Ps 118:43.
136 Cf. Ps 118:32 (2 Cor 6:11).
137 Cf. Lev 26:12 (2 Cor 6:16).
138 Ps 18:2.
139 Matt 3:17.
140 Ps 72:8.
141 Holl: τάξειεν, R: καλέσειεν, MSS: ὁμολογήσειεν.
142 Ps 104:15.
143 1 John 2:22–24.
144 Ps 118:46.

Ineffable, the Word, and the Wisdom and Power of Him who transcends wisdom and power, beyond anything that the tongue can utter, beyond any thought the mind can initiate. (5) *He is the perfect and abiding Offspring of Him who is perfect, and abides the same—not an overflow of the Father or a bit or piece of the Father, but come forth without passion and entire, from him who has lost none of what he had.* (6) *And because <the> Son is, and is called, the "Word," he is by no means to be conceived of as the Father's voice or verbal expression. For he subsists in himself and acts, and by him and in him are all things. Similarly, although he is Wisdom as well, he is not to be conceived of as the Father's thought, or as a movement and activity of his reason, but as an Offspring who is like the Father and bears the exact impress of the Father.* (7) *For the Father, God, has sealed him; and he neither inheres in another nor subsists by himself, but < is > an Offspring at work, who has made this universe and preserves it. This is sufficient to free us from the error of the Greeks, the willful worship of the Jews, and the heresy of the sectarians.*

31,1 *But since some pervert the sense of the scriptural expressions, interpret them otherwise than is fitting and understand neither the meaning of the words nor the nature of the facts, they dare to deny the Son's divinity because they stumble at the mention of creation in Proverbs, "The Lord created me the beginning of his ways, for his works."*[145] *(They should follow the Spirit who gives life, and not the letter which kills, for "The Spirit giveth life.")*[146] (2) *Let me also, then, venture on a short discussion of this, not because it has <not > been fully discussed by those who have spoken before me—to say this, one would be mad!—and not because you are in need of a teacher, for "Ye yourselves are taught of God,"*[147] *but so that I may be "manifest in your consciences."*[148] *For I am one of those who desire to "impart unto you some spiritual gift."*[149]

31,3 *Believe me, neither elsewhere in the scripture nor here do the words of scripture contradict each other, even though, to those of unsound faith or weak wits, they may seem to be in conflict. Believe me also, it is not possible to find in this world an example adequate in itself to explain clearly the nature of the Only-begotten.* (4) *And for this reason the scripture employs many ideas and terms with reference to the Only-begotten, to help us grasp things*

---

145 Prov 8:22.
146 2 Cor 3:6.
147 1 Thes 4:9.
148 2 Cor 5:11.
149 Rom 1:11.

that are above us with the aid of things familiar to us; to imagine things we do not know by means of things we do; and to advance, gently and by easy stages, from the seen to the unseen.

31,5 *Believers in Christ, then, should < know > that the Son is like the Father, since he who is "through all," and by whom all things in heaven and earth were made, is the "image" of him who is "above all."*[150] *But [they should know] that he is an image, not as an inanimate object is the image of a living thing or as a process is the image of an art, or a finished product the image of a process, but < as > an offspring is the image of its parent.* (6) *And [they should know] that the generation of the Only-begotten before the ages may not lawfully be portrayed < along the lines of > bodily human generation. And as < the Son is the* * *> Father's < wisdom* * *> in the pattern of the wisdom which embraces human thoughts, and though he is certainly not a nonentity and non-existent, the scripture made use of both terms, that of creation and that of generation, of "He created me" and "He begot me." This was not to give the appearance of saying contraries about the same things and at the same time, but to show the real and enduring existence of the Only-begotten through "created," and his special and individual character through "begot."* (7) *For he says, "I proceeded forth from the Father and am come."*[151] *The very word, "wisdom," however, is enough to exclude any idea of passion.*

32,1 *But whither are we bound with our failure to remember him who said, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!"*[152] (2) *We have the Spirit of truth for our teacher, whom the Lord gave us after his assumption into the heavens, that we might "know the things that are freely given to us of God."*[153] *In him "we likewise speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual."*[154] *In him we serve and worship, for his sake we are despised, in him the prophets prophesied, in him by whom we are brought to the Son, the righteous have been guided.*

But why do we meddle with nature? Am I speaking as with carnal persons, not spiritual? (3) *"We cannot speak unto you as unto spiritual but as unto carnal,"*[155] *was said of others. It is to be feared that, from our contention*

---

150 Col 1:15; Eph 4:6; Rom 9:5.
151 John 8:42.
152 Rom 11:33.
153 1 Cor 2:12.
154 1 Cor 2:13.
155 Cf. 1 Cor 3:1.

over the incomprehensible and dispute about the unsearchable, we may fall into the depths of impiety. "And I said, I will get wisdom, and it was farther from me than that which was before, and its depth was unsearchable; who shall find it out?"[156] *Let us be mindful of him who said,* (4) *"We know in part, and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away."*[157] *"If any man think that he knoweth, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know."*[158] *It is therefore to be feared that, if we attempt to speak of what we cannot, we may no longer be permitted to speak of what we can. We must speak because of faith, not believe because of what is spoken, for scripture says, "I believed, and therefore did I speak."*[159]

32,5 *Thus when we inquire, and try to contend, about the generation of God although we cannot describe our own, how can we avoid the risk that he who has given us not only "the tongue of instruction," but also the "knowledge of when to say a word,"*[160] *may condemn us to silence for our rashness of speech.* (6) *This was accomplished in the case of the blessed Zacharias. As he disbelieved the angel who had announced the child's conception, tested the grace and power of God by human reasonings, and despaired of his ability to father a child in his old age by an aged wife, what did he say?* (7) *"How shall I know that this will be? For I am old, and my wife well stricken in years."*[161] *And thus, since he was told, "Thou shalt be dumb and not able to speak,"*[162] *he could not speak when he left [the temple].*

33,1 *We therefore cease to wrangle over the questions in dispute and the matters that are beyond us, and hold fast what we have received. Who dare be puffed up over knowledge, when even he who was vouchsafed "revelations," who was caught up "to the third heaven" and "heard unspeakable words," was recalled to his senses by his "thorn in the flesh," so as not to be "puffed up above measure?"*[163] (2) *The very prophet who said, "I believed, and therefore have I spoken," also said, "I was afflicted "—and not simply "afflicted," but "sore afflicted."*[164] *The nearer one's apparent approach to*

---

156 Eccles 7:23–24.
157 1 Cor 13:9–10.
158 1 Cor 8:2.
159 Ps 115:1 (2 Cor 4:13).
160 Isa 50:4.
161 Luke 1:18.
162 Luke 1:20.
163 Cf. 2 Cor 12:12; 14.
164 Cf. Ps 115:1.

knowledge, the more should he reckon with his humanity. Hear the prophet say of him, "I said in my astonishment, All men are liars."[165]

33,3 *Since we have the Teacher of the truth, let us make no further use of the teachings of men. Let us realize <our limitation, believe*>, and waste no more effort on "modes," or anything else. As we cannot say how the Son was generated or describe the mode of the Father's generation, we <must> consider "All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made"*[166] *as sufficient for teaching.*

33,4 *The Lord grant that with a spirit like Abraham's, who said, "Now I have begun to speak with the Lord, though I am dust and ashes*[167]*—and not "exalted as the cedars of Lebanon,"*[168] *since equable, peaceable wisdom is not attained "by words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which faith teacheth*[169]*—we inquire* (5) *only into what we must do to please our God and Father, and along with him, and together with him, < the Son > in the Holy Spirit, < to whom > be glory, might, honor and power, now, and forever, and to the ages of ages. Amen.*

The end of Melitius' sermon

34,1 To those < who had been eager > to bring Melitius from Pontus, it seemed that this < had > not < been said > to please or placate most of the Arians, but to annoy them. They then egged the emperor on, plotted against Melitius for not having confessed that the Son is a creature in the fullest sense of the word, and expelled him from his see. (2) He was driven into exile overnight,[170] and is in exile to this day. Even now he resides in his own homeland, a man esteemed and beloved, especially because of the things I am now told that he has accomplished, and which are the cause of the confession his subjects in Antioch now make. They no longer make even a passing mention of the word, "creature," but confess that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are co-essential—three entities, one essence, one Godhead. (3) This is the true faith which we have received from the ancients, the faith of the prophets, Gospels and apostles, which our fathers and bishops confessed when they met at the Council of Nicaea in the presence of the great and most blessed emperor, Constantine. And

---

165 Ps 115:2.
166 John 1:3.
167 Gen 18:27.
168 Cf. Ps 36:35.
169 1 Cor 2:13.
170 Melitius was bishop of Antioch for less than a month, cf. Chrys. Panegyric on St. Melitius 1, PG 50,516.

may the most honored Melitius himself make the same confession as his subjects at Antioch and < those > who make it in certain other places! (4)[171] For there are also some, apparently in communion with him and his supporters, who blaspheme the Holy Spirit; and although they speak correctly of the Son, they regard the Spirit as a creature and altogether different from the Father. Later I shall give full information about them, as accurately as I can, in the refutation of the heresy they hold.

35,1 As I said, I hold Melitius in honor for the good things I have heard of him. And indeed his life is holy in the other respects, he is well conducted, and is beloved in every way by the laity for his way of life which all admire. (2) Some, however—I do not know whether they are inspired by enmity, or jealousy, or a desire to magnify themselves—[some] have said something about him to the effect that the rebellion against him was not over his orthodoxy, but because of canonical matters and the quarrel between him and his priests, and because he received certain persons whom he had previously expelled and condemned.[172] (3) But I have paid no attention to this because, as I indicated above, of the rectifications and the confessions of the faith which, at long last, are being made daily among his companions.

For I must tell the truth in this regard, as far as my weakness in everything allows. (4) Suppose that he overlooked < something > in the rush of the words of his exposition—I cannot say. Or suppose that, in all innocence, a word escaped him—God knows. In one way, two or three remarks in this exposition are questionable—his treating at all, even nominally, of the Son of God in his divine nature as a "creature," and his saying, "above wisdom," and perhaps something else.

36,1 But I shall say a little about their allegations and get finished with this discussion. Tell us, people, why would it disturb you to say that the homoeousion is the homoousion? Confess your faith plainly, to let us know that you belong to us, and are not strangers. Brass can be of an essence *like* gold, tin of an essence *like* silver, lead of an essence *like* iron—but the story you have concocted and turned out will not fool us. (2) For if you want to fool people, you < make > the false excuses that we must not say, "homoousion," or we will make the Son identical with the Father, or the Spirit identical with the Son and the Father. Here too the argument

[171] This paragraph is numbered 5 in Holl.
[172] Philost 5.5; Jer. Chron. ed. Helm pp. 241–242.

you have invented fails. (3) We say, not, "identically essential,"[173] but, "co-essential," to confess, not that < the Son > is any different from the Father, but that he is God actually begotten of God—not originating from some other source or from nothing, but come forth < from > the Father. He was begotten at no time, without beginning, and inexpressibly, is forever with the Father and never ceases to be, but is begotten, is not the Father's kinsman, not his progenitor.

36,4 For "homo" means that there are two entities, < but > not different in nature. Thus the true union [of the two essences] revealed by the Holy Spirit, through the expression in the mouths of those who use the expression. And you see that you will have no excuse, and cannot speak against orthodoxy and frighten your followers who accept your false argument, [by claiming] that whoever says, "homoousion," has professed faith in an identity. (5) No way! [That there are] two will be shown by "homoousion"; that the Offspring is not different from the Father will also be indicated by "homoousion."

36,6 But because of the word, "essence," you will be convicted of fabricating the homoeousion; and because of your altered confession of faith you will be condemned for not meaning what you say, but falsifying the teaching of what you mean. For if you mean that the Son is not of the Father at all, but is *like* him instead, you are a long way from the truth. (7) If one chooses to decorate a relief with any materials, no matter which, he cannot make it the same as the relief; indeed, the work is one of fabrication. But a thing begotten of some thing preserves the likeness of genus and the sameness of species which characterize legitimate sonship. (8) Now if you say that the Son is not begotten of the Father himself but must be outside of him, and call him "of like essence" to do him a favor, you have given him nothing, but have been deprived of his favor. (9) "He that honoreth not the Son as the Father honoreth him," says the holy apostle, "the wrath of God abideth on him."[174] And again, he who said, "I proceeded forth from the Father and am come,"[175] [said] "I am in the Father and the Father in me"[176] in the same breath as, "Philip, he that hath seen me hath seen the Father."[177]

---

173 ἁμοούσιον.
174 John 5:23; 3:36.
175 John 8:42.
176 John 14:10.
177 John 14:9.

37,1 Since I have often discussed these things, I believe that will be enough of the same refutations here. The same ones I applied earlier to the root that put forth their heresy are capable of demolishing these Semi-Arians here—[them], and the ones who split off from them, (2) Acacius' friends and the others who issued a creed at Seleucia in Isauria which is other than the true one. Because I wanted bring it to light, I have also inserted the whole of the creed they issued at the end, after the creed of Basil of Ancyra and George of Laodicea which was written as representing them all. (3) But lest it appear that when I put this in the second place I did it from forgetfulness—because it did its fearful damage secretly and accepted a gag as though to < restrain its own teachings > with a bridle in the time of hypocrisy—I shall also say a little about it and its authors, the allies of Acacius, Euzoeus, Eutychius and the rest. (4) And the document before us has plainly altered the confession of the truth. But lest it be said that I have slandered these people, let me point out what was discovered and what, as time went by, became evident in this group of theirs.

37,5 One of them is Euzoeus of Caesarea, who is their disciple and Acacius' successor. [That was] after the consecration of Philumen, who was consecrated by Cyril of Jerusalem; and the consecration of the elderly Cyril who was consecrated by Eutychius and his friends; and the consecration of Gelasius who, once more, was consecrated by Cyril of Jerusalem. He was the son of Cyril's sister. After the consecration of these three and their suspension because of the quarrel between them, Euzoeus was consecrated in his turn. (6) Gemellinus was also one of them, and Philip of Scythopolis, and Athanasius of Scythopolis. These not only teach Arianism publicly and not in secret, as though they had never heard of anything better; they do battle for their heresy, what is more, and persecute those who teach the truth. They are no longer willing merely to refute orthodox believers verbally, but subject them to feuds, violence and murder. For they have done harm, not in one city and country but in many. (38,1) < And* > this Lucius, who has done so much to those who confess the Son of God at Alexandria, is < one of them* >.

Who, if he has God's good sense, can fail to see < the dreadful things* > their fraternity < is doing* > every day? They preach in public that the Son of God is a creature, and that the Holy Spirit is a creature as well, and entirely different from the essence of God. (2) < There is no need for me even to speak of all that* > Eudoxius and his friends < are doing* > since George met his shameful end at Alexandria and Eudoxius received the headship, and the perquisites of high office. < He > was one of the group around Hypatius and Eunomius, and to flatter them pretended to be

convinced; < but >, though he kept it a secret, he never ceased to believe in the doctrines of the Anomoeans. (3) And he himself promoted Demophilus, Hypatius and Eunomius, men whom they had once exiled for this criminal exposition [of the creed]. They were disciples of Aetius, who was once exiled to the Taurus. He was made a deacon by George of Alexandria, and the root of the Anomoeans grew up from him. (4) As there is one thorny stem and the same root, but it < bears* > schisms of different kinds as though on each thorn, so it is with their malice. It has disgorged this filth into the world < by putting forth* >, differently at different times, the misinterpretations of this heretical sect, which keep getting worse. I shall say this again later about these Anomoeans.

38,5 But I think that for now, this much will do. Since we have scotched and maimed this sect like a horrid serpent let us stomp on it, leave it dead after trampling it, and turn away to hurry on to the rest, likewise calling on God to help us keep our promise.

Against Pneumatomachi.[1] *54, but 74 of the Series*

1,1 A sort of monstrous, half-formed people with two natures, as the mythographers < described > the Centaurs, Pans and Sirens, have been born to these Semi-Arians and orthodox believers, and have risen up against us. (2) The Arians of them declare the Son is not fully a creature, but a Son begotten outside of time. But they say with a hint of time that he < has been in existence > from of old[2] until now, and have thus by no means abandoned the formula originally spat out by Arius, which said that "There was a time when He was not" but that He "by whom things were made"[3] was before all time"; and they blaspheme the Holy Spirit < by saying that the Spirit is a creature >. (3) Others hold the truly orthodox view of the Son, that he was forever with the Father and has never ceased to exist, but has been begotten[4] without beginning and not in time. But all of these blaspheme the Holy Spirit, and do not count him in the Godhead with the Father and the Son.

---

[1] This Sect is Epiphanius' comment on a controversy in which he was deeply involved. The bulk of it is an excerpt from his *Ancoratus*, 65,1–73,9.

[2] Holl ἀπ᾽ αἰῶνος, MSS ἀπ᾽ οὐρανοῦ.

[3] John 1:3.

[4] Holl ἐστί γεγενημένος, MSS αὐτὸ γεγενημένον.

1,4 I often have discussed this extensively, and have given an authentic proof, at considerable length, in every Sect, that he is to be called, "Lord," with the Father and the Son. For the "Spirit of the Lord filleth the whole world"[5]—the "Spirit of truth,"[6] the Spirit of God. He is called the Spirit of the Lord, who "proceeds from the Father and receives of the Son,"[7] "giveth gifts severally as he will,"[8] "searcheth the deep things of God,"[9] and is with the Father and the Son, baptizing, sealing, and perfecting him whom he has sealed. (5) But to avoid assuming a burden here, I shall offer, for the reader's instruction and the enjoyment of those who have been vouchsafed the Holy Spirit, the things I have already said in opposition to the Spirit's blasphemers in my long work on the faith, which I wrote [in the form of a letter] to Pamphylia. It is as follows:

Excerpt from the Ancoratus[10]

2,1 *"The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ hath appeared, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, godly and righteously in this present world, looking for the blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."*[11] (2) *He "blotted out the handwriting of ordinances, which was against us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it."*[12] *"He hath broken the gates of brass and burst the bars of iron in sunder."*[13] *He made the light of life visible again, stretching forth his hand, showing the way, baring the foundations of heaven and demanding a dwelling place in Paradise once more. He therefore also caused "the righteousness of the Law"*[14] *"to dwell in us,"*[15] (3) *and has given us the Spirit, so that we may know him and the truth about him. That*

---

5 Wisd Sol 1:7.
6 John 16:13.
7 Cf. John 15:26; 16:14.
8 Cf. 1 Cor 12:11.
9 1 Cor 2:10.
10 Anc. 65,1–73,9.
11 Tit 2:11–14.
12 Col 2:14–15.
13 Cf. Isa 45:2.
14 Cf. Rom 8:4.
15 Cf. John 1:14.

is, he has become the beginning and end of our life, our "law of righteousness,"[16] *"law of faith,"*[17] *and "law of the Spirit,"*[18] *free from the "law of the flesh of sin."*[19]

2,4 *Therefore "I delight in the law of God after the inward man."*[20] *But our inward man is Christ, provided that he dwells in us.* (5) *For it is he who, by dying became our way to life "that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto" the Cause of life, "who died for them, and rose again."*[21] *"Mindful of the oath which," as David said, "he swore many generations before"*[22] *"God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their transgressions unto them."*[23]

2,6 *"For it pleased the Father than in him should all fullness dwell, and by him to reconcile all things unto himself, having made peace through the blood of the cross."*[24] (7) *He came, then, "for the dispensation of the fullness of the times," as he promised to Abraham and the other saints, "to gather in one all things in him, things which are in heaven and things which are on earth."*[25] (8) *There was estrangement and enmity "during the [time of the] forbearance of God,"*[26] *but he "reconciled them in the body of his flesh, making both one through him. For he came to be our peace"*[27] *and "as he who broke down the middle wall of partition, who abolished enmity in his flesh, the law of commandments contained in ordinances, for to make the twain one new man in himself."*[28] *And he commanded that the gentiles be "of the same body, and fellow partakers and fellow heirs of the promise"*[29] *by saying, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."*[30] (9) *And so "while I was weak, through the flesh,"*[31] *a Savior was sent to me "in the likeness of sinful flesh,"*[32] *and performed this gracious work, to*

---

16 Rom 9:31.
17 Rom 3:27
18 Rom 8:2
19 Rom 7:25.
20 Rom 7:22.
21 2 Cor 5:15.
22 Cf. Heb 5:9; Ps 104:8–9.
23 2 Cor 5:19.
24 Col 1:19–20.
25 Eph 1:10.
26 Rom 3:26.
27 Eph 2:14.
28 Eph 2:14–15.
29 Eph 3:6.
30 Matt 12:28.
31 Rom 8:3.
32 Rom 8:3.

"redeem"[33] *me from slavery, from corruption, from death. And he became my "righteousness, sanctification and redemption."*[34] (10) *Righteousness, by destroying sin through faith in him; sanctification, by setting us free through water and Spirit, and by his word; redemption, by giving his blood, giving himself for me as the atonement of a true lamb, an expiation for the world's cleansing, for the reconciliation of all in heaven and on earth, and so fulfilling, at the appointed time, the "mystery hidden before the ages and generations."*[35] (11) *And he "shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself,"*[36] *for "In him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily."*[37]

3,1 *Christ, the vessel of wisdom and of the Godhead, therefore as mediator "reconciles all things to God in him,"*[38] *"not imputing their trespasses,"*[39] *but fulfilling the hidden mysteries by faith in his covenant, which was foretold by the Law and the prophets. He is declared to be the Son of God, but called the Son of David, for he is both God and man, the "mediator between God and men,"*[40] *the true "house of God," the "holy priesthood."*[41] *He is the giver of the Holy Spirit, who in turn regenerates and renews all things for God; for "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, even the glory of the Only-begotten of the Father."*[42]

3,2 *When the rain is absorbed by trees and plants it engenders a body, each in the likeness of its fruit. The oil grows rich in the olive by receiving its essence from it, the sweet wine darkens in the vine, the fig sweetens on the fig tree, and [the rain] will generate new growth according to its kind in every seed.* (3) *So, I believe, God's Word was made flesh in Mary and became man in the seed of Abraham, in accordance with the promise, "We have found the Messiah of whom Moses did write."*[43] *As Moses said, "Let my word descend as the rain,"*[44] (4) *and David, "Let him come down as dew on a fleece and*

---

33 Cf. Gal 4:5.
34 1 Cor 1:30.
35 Col 1:26.
36 Phil 3:21.
37 Col 2:9.
38 2 Cor 5:18.
39 2 Cor 5:19.
40 1 Tim 2:5.
41 1 Pet 2:5.
42 John 1:14.
43 John 1:41; 45.
44 Deut 32:2.

like drops watering the earth";[45] *the wool will then increase the progeny of the fleece when it receives the dew. But when the earth receives the rain, since it receives it by the Lord's command it will increase the fruit for which husbandmen hope, yielding its essence gladly, but in eagerness to receive more from him.* (5) *So, when the Virgin Mary asked, "How shall I know that this will be to me?"*[46] *she was told, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon thee, and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee. Therefore also that which shall be bom of thee shall be holy, and called, Son of the Most High."*[47]

3,6 *Christ speaks in the angel, and in his fashioning of himself the Lord refashions himself by "taking the form of a servant."*[48] *And Mary absorbs the Word for conception as the earth absorbs the rain; but by taking mortal nature God's Word makes himself a holy fruit.* (7) *He was [born] of her who absorbed him, like earth and fleece—the fruit of the true hope, awaited by the saints as Elizabeth said, "Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb."*[49] *This [fruit] the Word received from humankind, and suffered although he was impassible.* (8) *He is the "living bread which came down from heaven"*[50] *and gives life. He is the fruit of the true olive, the oil of anointing and compounding which, as a type, Moses described.*[51] *He is the "true vine"*[52] *which only the Father tends, who has produced a joyous vintage for us.* (9) *He is the "living water, after taking which < the > man that thirsteth shall not thirst again, but it is in his belly springing up into everlasting life."*[53]

The new husbandmen have taken of this water and given it to the world, while the old husbandmen have withered and perished from unbelief. (10) *By his own blood he hallows the gentiles, but by his own Spirit he leads the called to the heavens. "As many as live by the Spirit of God, they live to God."*[54] *Those who are not so led are still reckoned as dead, and these are called "natural" or "carnal."*[55] (11) *Christ commands us, then, to abandon the works of the flesh which are the strongholds of sin, to put to death the members of death by his grace, and to receive the Holy Spirit which we did not have—*

---

45 Ps 71:6.
46 Luke 1:34.
47 Luke 1:35.
48 Phil 2:7.
49 Luke 1:40.
50 John 6:51.
51 Cf. Exod 30:22–24.
52 John 15:1.
53 John 4:10; 13; 14.
54 Rom 8:14.
55 1 Cor 2:14; 3:1; 3.

the Spirit who gives me life, though I am long dead and, unless I receive him, shall have died. For without his Spirit, all are dead. (12) *"If, therefore, his Spirit be in us, he that raised him from the dead shall quicken our mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in us."*[56] *In my opinion, however, both dwell in the righteous—Christ, and his Spirit.*

4,1 *If it is believed that Christ, as "God of God," is of the Father, and his Spirit is of Christ or of both—as Christ says, "who proceedeth from the Father,"*[57] *and, "He shall receive of me"*[58]*—and if it is believed that Christ is of the Holy Spirit—the angel's words are, "That which is conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit"*[59]*—[then] I know the Mystery that redeems me by faith, by hearing alone, by love for him who has come to me.* (2) *For God knows himself, Christ proclaims himself, the Holy Spirit reveals himself to the worthy.*

4,2 *A Trinity is proclaimed in the holy scriptures and is believed in with all seriousness, without contention, < by > the hearing of the creeds. From this faith comes salvation by grace—"righteousness is by faith without the works of the Law."*[60] (3) *< For > the scripture says that "the Spirit of Christ" is given to those who are saved "by the hearing of faith."*[61] (4) *And in my opinion, as I am taught by the scriptures, the catholic faith is declared by the voices of its heralds to be as follows:*

Three Holies, three of equal holiness; three Actuals, three of equal actuality; three Informed, three with the same form; three at work, three at one work; three Subsistents, three of the same subsistence, in co-existence. This is called a holy Trinity, one concord though they are three, one Godhead of the same essence, the same divinity, the same subsistence, like [generated] of like, resulting in the equality of the grace of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

To teach the how of this is left to them. (5) *"No man knoweth the Father save the Son; neither knoweth any man the Son, save the Father, and he to whom the Son will reveal him."*[62] *But he reveals him through the Holy Spirit.* (6) *Thus, whether these Persons, who are three, are of him, from him, or with him is properly understood by each Person, just as they reveal themselves as light, fire, wind, and I believe with other visionary likenesses, as the man*

---

[56] Rom 8:11.
[57] John 15:26.
[58] John 16:14.
[59] Matt 1:20.
[60] Rom 3:28.
[61] Gal 3:2.
[62] Matt 11:27.

reporting them is worthy. (7) *Thus the God who said "Let there be light" at the beginning "and there was" visible "light,"*[63] *is the same God who has given us the light to see "the true light, which lighteneth every man that cometh into the world"*[64]*—"Send forth thy light and thy truth,"*[65] *says David—and the same Lord who said, "In the latter days I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and their sons shall prophesy, and their daughters, and their young men shall see visions."*[66] *He has therefore shown us three Objects of sacred worship, of a triple subsistence.*

3,1 *"I say," therefore, "that Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises."*[67] *But I understand from the sacred scriptures that the Holy Spirit is his fellow minister, for the following reasons. Christ is sent from the Father; the Holy Spirit is sent. Christ speaks in the saints; the Holy Spirit speaks. Christ heals; the Holy Spirit heals. Christ hallows; the Holy Spirit hallows. Christ baptizes in his name; the Holy Spirit baptizes.*

3,2 *The scriptures say, "Thou shalt send forth thy Spirit, and thou shalt renew the face of the earth,"*[68] *which is like saying "Thou shalt send forth thy Word and melt them."*[69] (3) *"As they ministered to the Lord and fasted," says the scripture, "the Holy Spirit said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them."*[70] *This is like saying "The Lord said, Go into the city, and there it shall be told thee what thou must do."*[71] (4) *"So they, being sent forth by the Holy Spirit, departed unto Seleucia,"*[72] *is equivalent to Christ's saying, "Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves."*[73](5) *"It seemed good to the Holy Spirit to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things,"*[74] *is equivalent to his saying, "I say, yet not I, but the Lord, Let the wife not depart from her husband."*[75]

5,6 *"Now when they had gone throughout Phrygia and the region of Galatia, and were forbidden of the Holy Spirit to preach the word in Asia, after*

---

63 Gen 1:3.
64 John 1:9.
65 Ps 42:3.
66 Joel 2:28.
67 Rom 15:8.
68 Ps 103:30.
69 Ps 147:7.
70 Acts 13:2.
71 Acts 9:6.
72 Acts 13:4.
73 Matt 10:16.
74 Acts 15:28.
75 1 Cor 7:10.

they were come to Mysia they assayed to go into Bithynia: but the Spirit suffered them not,"[76] *is equivalent to Christ's saying, "Go, baptize all nations,"*[77] *< or >, "Carry neither scrip, nor staff, nor shoes."*[78] (7) *"Who said to Paul through the Spirit that he should not go up to Jerusalem"*[79]*—or Agabus' prophecy, "Thus saith the Holy Spirit, The man that owneth this girdle*[80]*—is like Paul's saying, "since ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in me,"*[81] *or, "Remember the words of the Lord, that he said, It is better to give than to receive."*[82]

5,8 *[Paul's], "And now, behold, I go bound in the Spirit"*[83] *is the equivalent of his, "Paul, a prisoner of Jesus Christ."*[84] (9) *"Save that the Holy Spirit witnesseth to me in every city,"*[85] *is equivalent to saying "The Lord testifieth to my soul that I lie not."*[86] (10) *[To say], "with power according to the Spirit of holiness,"*[87] *is similar to saying, "Holy is he who rests in the saints."*[88] (11) *[To say], "And circumcision is that of the heart, in the Spirit,"*[89] *is similar to saying, "And ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in the putting off the body of the sins by the circumcision of Christ."*[90]

5,12 *[To say], "If so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you,"*[91] *is similar to saying, "As ye have received Christ, walk ye in him."*[92] *And [to say], "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word is in my mouth,"*[93] (13) *and "having the firstfruits of the Spirit,"*[94] *is similar to saying, "Christ is the firstfruits."*[95] (14) *[To say], "But the Spirit himself maketh intercession for us,"*[96] *is similar to saying "who is on the right hand of God, who also maketh*

---

[76] Acts 16:6–7.
[77] Matt 28:19.
[78] Matt 10:10; Luke 10:4.
[79] Acts 21:4.
[80] Acts 21:11.
[81] 2 Cor 13:3.
[82] Acts 20:35.
[83] Philem 1; Eph 3:1.
[84] Acts 20:23.
[85] Cf. Gal 1:20.
[86] Cf. Gal 1:20.
[87] Rom 1:4.
[88] Isa 57:15.
[89] Rom 2:29.
[90] Col 2:11.
[91] Cf. 1 Cor 3:16.
[92] Col 2:6.
[93] 2 Kms 23:2.
[94] Rom 8:23.
[95] 1 Cor 15:23.
[96] Rom 8:26.

intercession for us."[97] (15) *[To say], "that the offering up of the gentiles may be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Spirit,"*[98] *is similar to saying "Now the Lord sanctify you, that ye may be sincere and without offense at the day of Christ."*[99] (16) *[To say], "But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit,"*[100] *is similar to saying, "When it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me."*[101] (17) *[To say], "Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God,"*[102] *is similar to saying, "Prove your own selves whether Christ be in you."*[103] (18) *[To say], "Ye are the temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwelleth in you,"*[104] *is similar to saying, "I will dwell in them and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people."*[105]

6,1 *Paul says, moreover, that justification and grace come from both [the Son and the Holy Spirit]. [To say], "justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of our God"*[106] *is similar to saying, "Being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ,"*[107] (2) *and "No man can say that Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Spirit";*[108] *and no one can receive the Spirit except from the Lord. [To say], "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit; there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord; and there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all,"*[109] *"from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord,"*[110](3) *and "Grieve not the Holy Spirit, in whom ye are sealed unto the day of redemption,"*[111] *is similar to saying, "Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we stronger than he?"*[112]

---

97 Rom 8:34.
98 Rom 15:16.
99 Phil 1:10.
100 1 Cor 2:10.
101 Gal 1:15.
102 1 Cor 2:12.
103 2 Cor 13:5.
104 1 Cor 2:16.
105 2 Cor 6:16.
106 1 Cor 6:11.
107 Rom 5:1.
108 1 Cor 12:3.
109 1 Cor 12:4–6.
110 2 Cor 3:18.
111 Eph 4:30.
112 1 Cor 10:22.

6,4 *[To say], "The Spirit speaketh expressly,"*[113] *is like saying, "Thus saith the Lord, the almighty."*[114] (5) *To say, "The Spirit standeth within you,"*[115] < *is like saying* >, *"If any man open to me, I and the Father will come in and make our abode with him."*[116]

6,6 *Isaiah said, "And the Spirit of the Lord is upon him,"*[117] *but Christ said, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me because he hath anointed me,"*[118] *"Jesus of Nazareth, whom God anointed with the Holy Spirit,"*[119] *or, "The Lord hath sent me, and his Spirit."*[120] (7) *And the voice of the seraphim, which cries, "Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of Sabaoth," is an obvious* example.[121]

6,8 *If you hear the words, "Being by the right hand of God exalted, having received of the Father the promise of the Spirit;"*[122] *or "Wait for the promise of the Father, which ye have heard,"*[123] *or "The Spirit driveth him into the wilderness;"*[124] *or the words of Christ himself, "Take no thought what ye shall say, for it is the Spirit of my Father that speaketh in you,"*[125] *or "If I cast out devils by the Spirit of God,"*[126] *or "He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness,"*[127] *and so on—or "Father, into thy hands I shall commend my Spirit,"*[128] *or "The child grew and waxed strong in the Spirit,"*[129] *or "Jesus, being full of the Holy Spirit, returned from Jordan",*[130] *or "Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit,"*[131] *or "That which is born of the Spirit is spirit;"*[132] *[any of this] is like saying, "That which was made, in him was life,"*[133] *or "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, the Spirit of truth."*[134] *"Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to*

---

113 1 Tim 4:1.
114 Hag 2:1.
115 Hag 2:5.
116 Cf. Rev 3:20; John 14:23.
117 Isa 11:2.
118 Luke 4:18.
119 Acts 10:38.
120 Isa 48:16.
121 Isa 6:3.
122 Acts 2:33.
123 Acts 1:4.
124 Mark 1:12.
125 Matt 13:11.
126 Matt 12:28.
127 Mark 3:29.
128 Luke 23:46.
129 Luke 1:80.
130 Luke 4:1.
131 Luke 4:14.
132 John 3:6.
133 John 1:3–4.
134 John 14:16–17.

the Holy Spirit?"[135] *as Peter said to Ananias, and further on, "Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God."*[136] *In other words the Holy Spirit, to whom they lied by keeping part of the price of their land, is God of God, and is God, or "God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit"*[137]—(9) *I cannot give a better argument than this.*

The Son is God: the scripture says, "Of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all God;"[138] *"Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved,"*[139] *"He spake unto them the word of the Lord," and "When he had brought them into his house he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with all his house"*[140]*—or, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God,"*[141] *or "The grace of our God and Savior hath appeared unto all men, teaching us,"*[142] *or "that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Savior in all things,"*[143] *or "looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ."*[144]

6,10 *But the service of the Spirit, and the service of the Word, is the same. [To say], "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Spirit hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God,"*[145] *is similar to saying, "I thank Christ Jesus our Lord, who hath enabled me, for that he counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry."*[146]

7,1 *As we have shown, the Son and the Holy Spirit work in cooperation with the Father: "By the Word of the Lord were the heavens established, and all the host of them by the Spirit of his mouth."*[147] *The Holy Spirit is an object of worship: "They that worship God must worship him in Spirit and in truth."*[148] (2) *But if the Spirit cooperates in the making of these things, a creature cannot make a creature; and the Godhead does not become a creature and is not known as God in some limited or circumscribed sense. For the Godhead*

---

135 Acts 5:3.
136 Acts 5:4.
137 1 Tim 3:16.
138 Rom 9:5.
139 Acts 16:31.
140 Acts 16:32; 34.
141 John 1:1.
142 Cf. Tit 2:11–12.
143 Tit 2:10.
144 Tit 2:13.
145 Acts 20:28.
146 1 Tim 1:12.
147 Ps 32:6.
148 John 4:24.

is boundless, infinite and incomprehensible, and surpasses all that God has made. (3) *Nor can a creature be an object of worship: "They worshiped the creature rather than the creator, and were made fools."*[149] *How can it not be foolish to make a god of a creature and break the first commandment, which says, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord,"*[150] *"There shall no strange god be in thee."*[151]

7,4 *However, in the sacred scriptures there are various names for the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. The Father's names are, "Father Almighty," "Father of all," "Father of Christ." The Son's are, "Word," "Christ," "true Light;" and the Holy Spirit's are, "Paraclete," "Spirit of truth, " "Spirit of God," "Spirit of Christ."* (5) *Further, our God and Father is regarded as light—indeed, as brighter than light, power, wisdom. But if our God and Father is light, the Son is light of light and thus "dwelleth in light which no man can approach unto."*[152] (6) *But God is all power, and thus < the Son > is "Lord of powers."*[153] *God is all wisdom, and the Son is therefore wisdom of wisdom, "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom."*[154] *God is all life, and the Son is thus life of life, for "I am the truth and the life."*[155]

7,7 *But the Holy Spirit is of both, as spirit of spirit. For "God is spirit,"*[156] *but God's Spirit*[157] *is the giver of spiritual gifts, utterly true, enlightener, Paraclete, conveyor of the Father's counsels.* (8) *For as the Son is "angel of a great counsel,"*[158] *so is the Holy Spirit. Scripture says, "Now we have received the Spirit of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not with the persuasion of words of wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit of God, comparing spiritual things with spiritual."*[159]

8,1 *But someone will say, "Then are we talking about two Sons? Why "*Only-*begotten?" "Nay, but who art thou that reckonest contrary to God?"*[160] *If God calls the One who is of him, the Son, and the One who is of Both, the Holy Spirit—things which are understood by the saints alone, by faith, which*

---

149 Rom 1:25; cf. v. 22.
150 Deut 6:4.
151 Ps 80:10.
152 1 Tim 6:16.
153 Ps 58:6.
154 Col 2:3.
155 John 14:6.
156 John 4:24.
157 Holl πενῦμα δὲ θεου, MSS; θεότης.
158 Isa 9:5.
159 1 Cor 2:12–13 and 12:4.
160 Cf. Rom 9:20.

are light, which give light, which have the power to enlighten, and create a harmony of light with the Father himself (2)*—[if this is so], Sir, hear with faith that the Father is the Father of a true Son and is all light, and that < the > Son is the < Son > of a true Father and is light of light, [and] not merely in name, as artifacts or created things are. And the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of truth, a third light, from the Father and the Son.*

8,3 *But all the other ["sons" and "spirits"] are such by adoption or in name, and are not [sons or spirits] like these, in actuality, power, light or meaning or, as one might say, "I have begotten sons and raised them up,"*[161] *"I have said, Ye are gods and ye are all children of the Most High,"*[162] *"Who hath begotten drops of dew,"*[163] *"of whom [is] the whole family in heaven and earth,"*[164] *or "I that establish thunder and create spirit."*[165] (4) *For the true Father has not begun to be a father [at some particular time], like the other fathers or patriarchs; nor does he ever cease to be a father. For if he begins to be a father he was at one time the son of another father, before being the Father of an Only-begotten himself. But fathers are presumed to be children in the likeness of their fathers, and the finding of the true father of this ancient history is an endless process.*

8,5 *Nor is the true Son new at being a son, like the others, who are children by adoption. For if he is new at being a son, there was a time when the Father was not the Father of an Only-begotten.*

8,6 *And the Spirit of truth is not created or made, like the other spirits, or called "the angel of the great counsel"*[166] *in the same sense as the other "angels."* (7) *Some things have a beginning and an end, but others have rule,* (i.e., ἀρχή playing on "beginning")*and might of an inconceivable kind. Some create all things for endless ages, in cooperation with the Father; others are created by these, as they will. Some worship the creators; others are fit for worship by all creatures. Some heal created things; others receive healing from the former.* (8) *Some are judged in accordance with their deserts; others have the power of righteous judgment. And some things are < in > time; others are not in time. Some illumine all; others are illumined by them. Some summon babes to the height; others are summoned by Him who is Mature. Some grant favors to all; others receive favors. And in a word, some hymn*

---

161 Isa 1:2.
162 Ps 81:6.
163 Job 38:28.
164 Eph 3:15.
165 Am 4:13.
166 Isa 9:5.

the Holiness in the heavens of heavens and the other invisible realms; others are hymned, and bestow their gifts on the worthy.

9,1 *But the scripture speaks of a great many spirits. [It says], "who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire,"*[167] *and "Praise the Lord, all ye spirits."*[168] (2) *The gift of "discernment of spirits"*[169] *is given to the worthy. Some spirits are heavenly and "rejoice in the truth";*[170] *some are of the earth and apt at deceit and error. Some are subterrestrial, children of the abyss and darkness. For the Gospel says, "They besought him that he would not send them away to go out into the abyss,"*[171] *and he accordingly gave the spirits this command. And he cast out spirits with a word and "suffered them not to speak."*[172]

9,3 *We are told of "a spirit of judgment and a spirit of burning."*[173] *We are also told of a spirit of the world—"We have not received the spirit of the world,"*[174] *says scripture—and a spirit of man: "What man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him?"*[175] *[We are told of] "a spirit that passeth away and cometh not again,"*[176] *"for the spirit hath passed through him and he shall not be,"*[177] *and "Thou shall take away their spirits and they shall perish."*[178]

9,4 *And "Spirits of prophets are subject to prophets,"*[179] *and "Behold, a lying spirit stood before the Lord, and he said unto him, Wherewith shalt thou deceive Ahab? And he said, I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of the prophets."*[180]

9,5 *We are told of a "spirit of compunction,"*[181] *a "spirit of fear,"*[182] *a "spirit of divination,"*[183] *a "spirit of fornication,"*[184] *a "spirit of tempest,"*[185] *a "talk-*

---

167 Ps 103:4.
168 Cf. Ps 150:6.
169 1 Cor 12:10
170 Cf. 1 Cor 13:6.
171 Luke 8:31; cf. Mark 5:10.
172 Luke 4:41.
173 Isa 4:4.
174 1 Cor 2:12.
175 1 Cor 2:11.
176 Ps 77:39.
177 Ps 102:16.
178 Ps 103:24.
179 1 Cor 14:32.
180 3 Kms 22:21–22.
181 Isa 29:10 (Rom 11:8).
182 2 Tim 1:7.
183 Acts 16:16.
184 Hos 4:12.
185 Ps 10:6.

ative spirit,"[186] *a "spirit of infirmity,"*[187] *an "unclean spirit,"*[188] *a "deaf and dumb spirit,"*[189] *a "spirit with an impediment in its speech,"*[190] *a "spirit exceeding fierce, which is called Legion,"*[191] *and the "spiritual forces of wickedness."*[192] *There is no end to what is said about spirits by the wise.*

9,6 *But just as most "sons" are sons by adoption or in name but not actual sons, since they have beginnings and ends and < were conceived > in sin, so most spirits are spirits by adoption or in name—even though they are sinful. Only the Holy Spirit, however, is called the "Spirit of truth, " "Spirit of God," "Spirit of Christ" and "Spirit of grace" by the Father and the Son.* (7) *For he graciously gives good to each in various ways—"to one a spirit of wisdom, to another a spirit of knowledge, to another a spirit of might, to another a spirit of healings, to another a spirit of prophecy, to another a spirit of discernment, to another a spirit of tongues, to another a spirit of interpretations,"*[193] *and as the scripture says, "One and the selfsame Spirit" [grants] the rest of the gracious gifts, "dividing to every man severally as he will."*[194] (8) *For as David says, "Thy good Spirit, O God, will guide me,"*[195] *or "The Spirit doth breathe where he will"—with words like these he has shown us the Holy Spirit's reality—"and thou hearest his voice, but canst not tell whence he cometh or whither he goeth."*[196] *And the words, "except ye be born of water and the Spirit"*[197] *are similar to Paul's, "In Christ Jesus I begot you."*[198]

9,9 *Of the Holy Spirit, the Lord said, "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me,"*[199] *and "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak, and he will show you things*

---

186 Job 8:2.
187 Luke 13:11.
188 Mark 1:23 et al.
189 Mark 9:25.
190 Cf. Mark 7:32.
191 Matt 8:28; Mark 5:9; Luke 8:30.
192 Eph 6:12.
193 Cf. 1 Cor 12:8–10.
194 1 Cor 12:11.
195 Ps 142:10.
196 John 3:8.
197 John 3:5.
198 1 Cor 4:15.
199 John 15:26.

to come. He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine and shall show it unto you."[200]

10,1 *Now if the Spirit proceeds from the Father and, as the Lord says, is to receive "of mine,"* (2) *I will venture to say that, just as "No man knoweth the Father save the Son, nor the Son save the Father,"*[201] *so no one knows the Spirit except the Son from whom he receives and the Father from whom he proceeds. And no one knows the Son and the Father except the Holy Spirit who truly glorifies them, who teaches all things, who testifies of the Son, is from the Father, is of the Son, is the only guide to truth, the expounder of holy laws, instructor in the spiritual law, preceptor of the prophets, teacher of the apostles, enlightener with the doctrines of the Gospels, elector of the saints, true light of true light.*

10,3 *The Son is a real Son, a true Son, a legitimate Son, the unique Son of a unique Father. With him also is the Spirit—< not a Son >, but termed, "Spirit."* (4) *This is the God who is glorified in the church: Father forever, Son forever, Holy Spirit forever; Sublime < of > Sublime, and the Most High; spiritual, of glory unbounded; the One to whom all that is created and made—in a word, the universe with its measurements and each thing that is contained—is inferior.*

10,5 *The Godhead is chiefly declared to be a unity in the Law of Moses, but is vehemently proclaimed a duality in the prophets, and is revealed as a Trinity in the Gospels, for over the times and generations it accords more closely with the righteous in knowledge and faith. And this knowledge is immortality, and adoption is by faith in it.* (6) *But as though it were erecting the temple's outer wall in the Law of Moses, it gives the ordinances of the flesh first of all. It expounds the ordinances of the soul second, as though it were putting the sacred objects in place in the remaining prophets. But third it gives the ordinances of the spirit, as though, in the Gospels, arranging the mercy seat and Holy of Holies for its dwelling, but as its holy tabernacle a holy people < who* > have none but the righteous as their companions.*

10,7 *In this people there dwells one infinite Godhead, one imperishable Godhead, one incomprehensible Godhead, unfathomable, inexpressible, invisible. It alone knows itself; it reveals itself to whom it will. It raises up its witnesses, calls, predestines and glorifies them, lifts them up from hades, hallows them.* (8) *For its own glory and faith it makes these three one: things in heaven, on earth, and under the earth; spirit, soul and flesh; faith, hope and*

---

[200] John 16:12–14.
[201] Matt 11:27.

charity; past, present and future; the ages, the eternal ages, and the ages of ages; Sabbaths of Sabbaths; the circumcision of the flesh, the circumcision of the heart, and "the circumcision of Christ by the putting off of the body of the sins."[202] (9) *In a word, it purifies all things for itself, things visible and invisible, thrones, dominions, principalities authorities, powers. But in all is the same holy voice crying, "Holy, Holy, Holy," from glory to glory, < to glorify > the Father in the Son, and the Son in the Father with the Holy Spirit, to whom be glory and might unto the ages of ages. Amen. And he who so believes will say "So be it! So be it."*

The End of the Material < from > the Ancoratus

11,1 And these are the things which I have already written, with my extremely limited ability, in explanation of the faith in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and have cited in the preceding paragraphs. But as a testimony to my own salvation I shall continue with the godly citation of texts, and the godly discussion, based on right reason, of the Godhead.

11,2 [It is plain] that the Only-begotten has been shown by many testimonies in the previous discussion to act in concert with the Father, and to do the same things in all respects and grant the same graces, since he is "of the Father," and is not different from the Father's power and Godhead, but is co-essential with the Father. And not only the Son—the Holy Spirit has been shown to act in concert with the Son and the Father, to do the same things, and to give and grant the same graces as he will, since he too is truly "of God," and not different from the Father and the Son, but co-essential with the Father and the Son. This is plain to everyone, and has been and will be entirely proven by such a large number of texts.

However, because of the Holy Spirit's opponents and enemies I shall present the godly conclusions from right reason, and the arguments from texts in the same sacred scripture, that concern only the Holy Spirit, and present them in addition to the other texts, in accordance with the true godly doctrine of the Holy Spirit. (4) For as is the truth, the Holy Spirit too is unique, is worshiped by all, is beloved by all things created and made, and is not to be equated with anything—no angel, no spirit—but is one of a kind. (5) For there are indeed many spirits, but since the Holy Spirit is eternally of the Father, and is not engendered by other beings, which were made from nothing, this Spirit is high above all spirits. As there is one God, and one only-begotten Son of God, so there is < one > Holy Spirit of God, but *of* God and *in* God.

---

[202] Col 2:11.

11,6 But the only-begotten Son is incomprehensible, and the Spirit is incomprehensible; however, he is of God, and is not different from the Father and the Son. He is not an identity with the Father and the Son; there is an eternal Trinity of the same essence, not an essence other than the Godhead and not a Godhead other than the essence, but the same Godhead. And of the same Godhead are the Son and the Holy Spirit. (7) And the Spirit is a holy spirit, but the Son is a son. The Spirit proceeds from the Father and receives of the Son, "searcheth the deep things of God,"[203] "sheweth"[204] the things of the Son to the world, and hallows the saints through the Trinity. He is third in the enumeration [of the Trinity]—the Trinity is the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, for scripture says, "Go baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."[205] He is the confirmation of the grace (i.e., of baptism), the seal of the Trinity, not apart from the numeration, not different from its naming, and not other than its gift[206]—but there is one God, one faith, one Lord, one gift, one church, one baptism.

12,1 For, as I have often said, the Trinity is forever a Trinity, and never receives an addition. It is sweet to confess this faith, and one never tires of saying it; for the prophet says, "Sweet are thy words unto my throat."[207] (2) And if the words are sweet, how much sweeter is the holy name, "Trinity," the fount of all sweetness? This, then, is the enumeration of the Trinity: "Father, Son and Holy Spirit." (3) The Trinity is not an identity and cannot be separated from its oneness, and yet the Father is perfect in the subsistence of perfection, the Son is perfect, the Holy Spirit is perfect—Father, Son and Holy Spirit (4) Conversely, the Holy Spirit is enumerated among the spiritual gifts: "For there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit, and there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord, and there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God that worketh all in all."[208]

---

[203] 1 Cor 2:10.

[204] Cf. John 16:15.

[205] Matt 28:19.

[206] The foregoing expressions concern the rite of baptism, in which the candidate is baptized "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." This naming of the Trinity is its "enumeration," and the Holy Spirit's name comes last as "confirmation" or "seal."

[207] Ps 118:103.

[208] 1 Cor 12:4–6.

12,5 And since such is the case, let us make sure not to be deprived of the truth, but let us confess the truth instead—not to plead for God, but to think of him piously, lest we perish. To say or think that there is any created thing in the Trinity, or anything added to it, is unacceptable; the Trinity was always the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.

12,6 The Son is neither the Father's kinsman nor identical with him, and the Spirit is neither identical with nor the kinsman of the Father and the Son. (7) The Son is begotten of the Father and the Spirit proceeds from the Father, though in some ineffable way the Trinity exists in an identity of its glory and is incomprehensibly a Son, and likewise a Holy Spirit, with a Father; nor does the Trinity ever cease from the same eternity. (8) The Father, then, is forever ingenerate, uncreated and incomprehensible. The Son is begotten, but uncreated and incomprehensible. The Holy Spirit is eternally—not generate, not created, not a kinsman, not an ancestor, not an offspring, but a Holy Spirit of the same essence as the Father and the Son, "For God is spirit."[209]

13,1 In every scripture there are testimonies to our salvation, in all its sureness. I shall cite as few as I can of the many [there are], in order, even at this stage, not to leave the exposition without a witness to the Holy Spirit. (2) For example, to declare to all the faithful, for their salvation, the genuineness of his Holy Spirit, the Father says of the Son's human nature, "I shall put my Spirit upon him, and he shall proclaim judgment to the gentiles."[210] (3) Then, by his own testimony, the Only-begotten adds, 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me"[211]—a plain acknowledgment, by Christ's testimony, that his human nature is certified and proclaimed to the faithful by the Holy Spirit, for the Spirit is not different from God.

13,4 But again, the Lord says of the Spirit, "It is the Spirit of my Father that speaketh in you."[212] And again, since the Spirit is not different from the Father's divinity, "He breathed in the faces of the disciples and said, Receive ye the Holy Spirit."[213] And again, to show his equality and co-essentiality, and his Father's, with the Holy Spirit, he said, "If ye love me, keep my commandments. And I shall pray the Father, and he will give you

209 John 4:24.
210 Isa 42:1.
211 Luke 4:18.
212 Matt 10:20.
213 John 20:22.

another advocate"[214]—since the Lord himself is an advocate, and the Holy Spirit likewise is his fellow advocate.

13,5 And to show that the Spirit is not a servant, but is of the same Godhead [as the Son], the apostles gave intimation of his authority by saying, "And the Holy Spirit said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them,"[215] and so on. (6) But Paul says plainly of him, "The Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty,"[216] and, "Ye are the temple of God, and the Spirit of the Lord dwelleth in you."[217] (7) Now if we are called God's temple because of the Holy Spirit's indwelling, who would dare to reject the Spirit and separate him from the essence of God—when the apostle plainly says that we become God's temples because of the Holy Spirit who dwells in the worthy? And how can the Spirit who "searcheth the deep things of God"[218] be different from God?

And don't tell me, (8) "He *searches,* but he doesn't *know* yet," as some dare to blaspheme him to their own destruction. [If this were so] they should say < the > same of the Father, for even of him scripture says, "He *searcheth* the treasuries of the belly."[219] (9) And if you intend to take an impious view [of the Spirit] because knowledge does not follow searching in the Spirit's case, you must speak impiously of the Father too, and be compelled to express the same wrong notion. No "knowing" is added to "The Father searcheth the treasuries of the belly"—there would be no need to say it—since God's foreknowledge is made plainly evident, < and > fully expressed, by the word, "search." So please < understand > the one knowledge and foreknowledge in the Spirit, the Son and the Father, since the Holy Trinity is plainly perfect and identical.

14,1 An untold amount could be said about this, and it would be possible to cite a mass of texts from sacred scripture, and drag them out at length and burden the readers. (2) For by speaking at length in every Sect I, despite my weakness, have sufficiently refuted them all by the power of God, and have shown that all sects are strangers to the truth, and that

---

214 John 14:15–16.
215 Acts 13:2.
216 2 Cor 3:17.
217 1 Cor 3:16.
218 1 Cor 2:10.
219 Prov 20:17.

each of them blasphemes and denies the truth, whether in a minor or in a major matter.

So with these people < who > blaspheme the Lord and the Holy Spirit to no purpose and, as the Lord has said, have no "remission" of sins "here or in the world to come"[220] because of their blasphemy of the Holy Spirit—and who have been trodden underfoot by the truth itself, (3) like a dreadful horned asp with its single horn, since the blasphemous mind is capable of destroying the entire body. And they have been struck by the preaching of the cross and the true confession of the Only-begotten—for, as I said, for a blasphemer of the Holy Spirit "There shall be no forgiveness either in this world or in the world to come"—and have been trodden on and crushed; for they cannot prevail against the truth.

14,4 All the sects are truly "gates of hell," but "They will not prevail against the rock,"[221] that is, against the truth. For even though some of them choose to say, "We too profess the creed that was issued at Nicaea; show me from it that the Holy Spirit is counted as divine," they will find themselves confounded even by this. (5) The dispute then was not about the Holy Spirit. The councils make sure of the matter that arises at a particular time. Since Arius was directing the insult at the Son, there was accuracy of language about him, with additional discussion. (6) But observe from the creed itself that there is no way in which the blasphemers of the Spirit, the Pneumatomachi who are strangers to his gift and sanctification, can make their point here either. (7) The creed at once confesses, and does not deny, "We believe in one God, the Father Almighty." But "We believe" is not left at that. The faith is in God "and in one Lord Jesus Christ." < And > this is not left at that. The faith is in God "and in the Holy Spirit." (8) And all this is not left at that. The three "We believes" make it evident that the faith is in one glory, one unity and one co-essentiality—three Perfects but one Godhead, one essence, one glory, one dominion. And here too their argument has failed.

14,9 And how long am I to go on? I believe that what I have said against them will suffice for those who love the truth. I shall therefore pass this sect by too, beseeching God to aid me as usual in the refutation of them all, so that, by his power, I may keep my promise and give him thanks in every way.

---

220 Matt 12:32.
221 Matt 16:18.

Against Aerius[1] *55, but 75 of the Series*

1,1 Again, one Aerius has likewise become a great misfortune for the world, a person with cracked brains and inflated pride. For from first to last, malice has been the cause of every sect that has arisen—[malice], or a spirit of vainglory or pride, or a lustful appetite, or envy of one's neighbors, or temper, or rashness. (2) In a word, blindness is of the devil, though the devil has no power to deceive anyone who does not want him to. Everyone is responsible for his own sinning, as the scripture says, "that they which are approved may be made manifest."[2]

1,3 Aerius is still alive in the flesh and survives, a thoroughgoing Arian. Because he has inquired further into Arian speculations he holds beliefs that are no different, but are like those of Arius, And in his turn he has his tongue sharpened and his mouth battle-ready, to attract a deluded band, and a throng of people whose ears are itching and minds receptive. (4) For he too has invented a monstrous fictitious doctrine with nothing to it—a source of some amusement to the sensible, but he has still deceived and perverted many with it.

1,5 Aerius was the fellow student of Eustathius the son of Sebastius, of Sebaste, in the country called Pontus, or Lesser Armenia. For Eustathius and Aerius were ascetics together. (6) When Eustathius attained the episcopate, however, Aerius wanted this instead, but could not get it. This is the kind of thing that arouses jealousy. Still, Eustathius appeared to be standing by Aerius. (7) He made him a presbyter immediately afterwards, and entrusted him with the hospice, which in Pontus is called an alms-house. For they make arrangements of this kind out of hospitality, and the leaders of the churches there lodge the crippled and infirm, and supply < their needs* > as best they can.

2,1 But since Aerius' anger had not left him, there were more words between them every day, the jealousy between them increased, and evil reports and slanders of Eustathius were circulated by Aerius. But the bishop Eustathius sent for Aerius and cajoled him, admonished, threatened, rebuked, pleaded with him, and got nowhere. For the thing that had been begun was going on, to very ill effect.

---

[1] Epiphanius' information about his contemporary, Aerius, may well have come from oral sources, or been common report. However, the succession of quotations at 3,4–7, sometimes introduced by such formulas as "Next he says," or "after this," suggest that Epiphanius had a literary source as well.

[2] 1 Cor 11:19.

2,2 Aerius finally left the hospice and withdrew from the world, on the pretext < that Eustathius was appropriating the church's funds. From that time on* > he scrutinized < Eustathius' life* >, like a man out to get something on an enemy or take a shot at a foe.

(3) And in the end he slandered Eustathius to everyone, and said, "He is no longer the sort of man < you think he is* >, but has turned to the acquisition of wealth, and all sorts of property." (4) All this was calumny on Aerius' part. Eustathius was in fact in charge of the church's affairs, and he could not do otherwise. And [yet] the things Aerius was saying sounded convincing.

2,5 Since I have introduced Eustathius while speaking against Aerius, one might suppose that I also regard Eustathius as commendable. No few admire his life and conduct, and if his faith were only orthodox too! (6) For he too held Arius' position from first to last, and not even the hardships of the persecutions set him straight—he was persecuted with Basil, Eleusius and others.[3] (7) But apparently he also went on an embassy with other bishops to the blessed Liberius of Rome, and signed the creed of the Council of Nicaea, and its confession of orthodoxy. (8) Later, however, as though he had regained his memory and awakened from dreams, he never ceased to look to his original principles, the Arian heresy. But this is about Aerius—we must get back to him.

3,1 For the reasons we have given, Aerius originally preened himself on renunciation of the world; but when he left the hospice he took a large body of men and women with him. (2) With his < fellowship > he was driven from the churches, and from cultivated lands and villages, and the other towns. He often lived out in the snow with his numerous band of followers, and lodged in the open air and caves, and took refuge in the woods. (3) But his teaching was more insane than is humanly possible, and he says, "What is a bishop compared with a presbyter? The one is no different from the other. There is one order," he said, "and one honor and one rank. A bishop lays on hands," he said, "but so does a presbyter. The bishop administers baptism, and the presbyter does too. The bishop performs the eucharistic liturgy, the presbyter likewise. A bishop occupies the throne, and the presbyter also occupies one." With this he misled many, < who > regarded him as their leader.

[3] Eustathius was deprived of his see at the Synod of Constantinople in 360.

(4) Next he says, "What is the Passover you celebrate? You are giving your allegiance to Jewish fables again. We have no business celebrating the Passover," he says; "Christ was sacrificed for our Passover."[4]

3,5 Then, after this: "Why do you mention the names of the dead after their deaths (i.e., in the liturgy)? < If > the living prays or has given alms, how will this benefit the dead? If the prayer of the people here has benefited the people there, no one should practice piety or perform good works! He should get some friends any way he wants, either by bribery or by asking friends on his death bed, and they should pray that he may not suffer in the next life, or be held to account for his heinous sins.

3,6 "And there can be no set time for fasting," he says. 'These are Jewish customs, and 'under a yoke of bondage.[5] 'The Law is not made for the righteous, but for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers[6] and the rest. If I choose to fast at all, I shall fast of my own accord, on the day of my choice, because of my liberty." (7) And they therefore make a point of fasting on Sunday instead [of the usual days], and eating on Wednesdays and Fridays. They often fast on Wednesday also, but by their own choice, they say, not by an ordinance.

3,8 And during the days of Passover, while we sleep on the ground, purify ourselves, endure hardships, eat dry bread, pray, watch and fast, performing all the saving < mortifications* > of the holy Passovers, they buy meat and wine early in the morning, stuff their veins, < and > burst out laughing in mockery of those who keep this holy service of the week of the Passover.

3,9 Indeed, even though they have had the custom of renunciation they have not practiced it. < There is > a great deal of eating of meat and drinking of wine—unless there are a scant few of them who choose < to do > this by their own preference. But most of them indulge lavishly in meat dishes and wine-drinking, as I have often remarked. These are the teachings which Aerius has spat up into the world.

4,1 Thus he shows the world his intent, unbelief, and his mad teachings, again mischievously brought to the world by him. (2) But I shall go on to the arguments against him, make a few points, and then pass him by. < From > his saying that a bishop and a presbyter are the same, it is plain to people with sense that he is simply foolish. How can this be? The

[4] 1 Cor 5:7.
[5] 1 Tim 6:1.
[6] 1 Tim 1:9.

one is an order that generates fathers. For the episcopate produces fathers for the church. But the presbyterate, which cannot produce fathers, produces children through the laver of regeneration, but surely not fathers or teachers. (3) And since he is not ordained for the purpose of ordaining, how could a presbyter consecrate a bishop, or say that he is equal to a bishop? Aerius' quarrel and his jealousy have deceived him.

4,4 For his own and his hearers' deception he alleges that the apostle writes to "presbyters and deacons"[7] and not to bishops, and tells the bishop, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which thou didst receive at the hands of the presbytery;"[8] and again, elsewhere he writes "to bishops and deacons"[9] so that, as Aerius says, bishops and presbyters are the same. (5) And he, as not knowing the true order of events, and not having read the most searching investigations, does not realize that the holy apostle wrote about the problems which arose when the Gospel was new. Where bishops were already consecrated he wrote to *bishops* and deacons, for the apostles could not establish everything at once. (6) There was a need for presbyters and deacons, for the business of the church can be done by these two. But where there was no one worthy of the episcopate, the place remained without a bishop. Where there was a need for one, however, and there were persons worthy of the episcopate, bishops were consecrated.

4,7 But where the congregation was not large they had no presbyters for ordination, and made do solely with the local bishop. However, there can be no bishop without a deacon. And the holy apostle saw to it that the bishop had deacons to assist him; in this way the church got its business done. (8) This is what local churches were like at that time. All did not get each thing at the start, but what was needed was arranged for as time went on.

5,1 For according to the Old Testament, Moses was sent straight to Egypt by God with nothing but a staff. < But > on his entry into Egypt he was also given his brother Aaron to help him. (2) Then, after his brother believed him, the council of elders, and the leaders of the people at that time, were gathered for him. And after this, when his work was established and his following was gathered, he passed through the sea.

5,3 And they were not yet living by the Law, until < the > Lord called him into the mount. But he gave him the tablets, and told him how to

[7] I.e., all communications apparently addressed to bishops are addressed to presbyters.
[8] 1 Tim 4:14.
[9] Phil 1:1.

make a tabernacle, and appoint officials, captains of tens, fifties, hundreds and thousands. (4) And do you see how things were expanded? "See," says God, "that thou make all things according to the pattern that was shown thee in Mount Sinai."[10]

5,5 And you see how a seven-branched lampstand was added to the legislation, and long robes, priestly vestments, bells and woolen cloaks, brooches and turbans, miters and jewelry made from various stones; ladles, censers, lavers, altars, bowls, "masmaroth," which are strainers, "midikoth," which means ladles, "machonoth," which are bases—and everything the Law speaks of, cherubim and the rest, the ark of the covenant, carrying poles and rings; the tabernacle, and hides and skins dyed scarlet; curtain rings and the rest; doorkeepers, wooden trumpets and curved trumpets, trumpets made of gold, silver, bronze < and > horn—and everything else the Law said, different kinds of sacrifices, teachings. (6) Because this was not in force from the beginning, were the things not given < permanent status > after they had been ordained? (7) Thus the things the apostle wrote applied until the church expanded, achieved its full growth, and < filled > the world with the knowledge < which > has been most rightly established by the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. And Aerius' argument has failed.

5,8 And < by giving indication >, through the holy apostle, of who a bishop is and who a presbyter is, the word of God teaches that they cannot be the same. Paul says to Timothy, who is a bishop, "Rebuke not a presbyter, but entreat him as a father."[11] (9) What was the point of a bishop's not rebuking a presbyter, if he did not have the authority over the presbyter? Once more, it says, "Receive not hastily an accusation against a presbyter, save by two or three witnesses."[12] (10) And he never told any presbyter, "Receive not an accusation against a bishop," or wrote to any presbyter not to rebuke a bishop. And you see that the fall of anyone the devil shakes loose is no light one.

6,1 But let us see and investigate his other teachings. And let us speak first of the Passover, as scripture says, "Christ is sacrificed for our Passover."[13] Let's see whether the man who said that, didn't keep the Passover himself. Scripture says, "He hasted to keep the Feast of Pentecost at Jerusalem."[14]

---

[10] Exod 25:40.
[11] 1 Tim 5:1.
[12] 1 Tim 5:19.
[13] 1 Cor 5:7.
[14] Acts 20:16.

But what Pentecost was Paul keeping if he hadn't kept the Passover? (2) And who, anywhere in the world, does not agree that Wednesdays and Fridays are designated as fasts in the church? If, indeed, I need to speak of the Ordinance of the Apostles, they plainly decreed there that Wednesdays and Fridays be fasts at all times except Pentecost,[15] and directed that nothing at all be eaten on the six days of the Passover except bread, salt and water;[16] and which day to keep, and that we break our fast on the night before the Lord's Day. (3) But who has better knowledge of these things? The deluded man who has just arrived and is still alive today, or those who were witnesses before us, who have had the tradition in the church before us and received it in this form from their fathers—and their fathers in their turn, who learned it from those before them, just as the church possesses the true faith and the traditions to this day because she has received them from her fathers? And again, so much for his idea of the Passover!

6,4 But then, if the same apostles did not speak of this very subject of Wednesdays and Fridays in the Ordinance, I could prove it in all sorts of other ways. But they wrote about this in specific terms, the church has received it, and there was a world-wide agreement before Aerius and his Aerians. (5) Perhaps Aerius was very aptly named for this reason; he has received an unclean spit of the air, the airish "spirit of wickedness"[17] which, in him, laid siege to the church.

7,1 And then, as to naming the dead, what could be more helpful? What could be more opportune or wonderful than that the living believe that the departed are alive and have not ceased to be but exist, and live with the Lord—(2) and that the most sacred doctrine should declare that[18] there is hope for those who pray for their brethren as though they were off on a journey?

7,3 And even though the prayer we offer for them cannot root out all their faults—[how could it], since we often slip in this world, inadvertently and deliberately—it is still useful as an indication of something more perfect. (4) For we commemorate both righteous and sinners. Though we pray for sinners, for God's mercy,[19] and *for* the righteous, the

---

[15] This is not in the Didascalia, but Const. Ap. 5.20.14 directs that festival be kept on Pentecost and the week following.

[16] Didascalia 21 (S-S p. 216; A-F p. 111).

[17] Eph 6:12.

[18] I.e., rather than praying *to* them.

[19] For example, in the Liturgy of St. James, Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern*, p. 57.

fathers, the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, evangelists, martyrs and confessors, for bishops and anchorites and the whole band [of saints],[20] (5) we worship our Lord Jesus Christ to distinguish him from the whole of humanity by our honor of him, remembering that the Lord is not on a level with any man—even though each man has < performed > a million righteous deeds and more.

7,6 For how could this be? The one is God; the other, man. The one is in heaven and the other, because of his earthly remains, is on earth—except for those who have risen and entered the bridal chamber as the holy Gospel says, "And many bodies of the saints arose and went in with him into the holy city."[21]

7,7 But which holy city does he mean? [Both], for the words apply to both, the city here and the city on high. For they plainly entered the earthly Jerusalem with him first. But before the Savior's ascent into heaven, no one had ascended until the time at which they ascended with him, "For no man hath ascended into heaven but he that came down from heaven, the Son of Man."[22] Since I am on the subject, I have given the two proof-texts for this. But if anyone asks, "Did they go *into* Jerusalem?" he should learn that on that day, "When the doors were shut, Jesus came to where the disciples were gathered, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you."[23]

8,1 But I shall take up the thread of this topic once more. The church is bound to keep this custom because she has received a tradition from the fathers. (2) And who can violate a mother's precept or a father's law? As the words of Solomon < tell us >, "Hear, my son, the words of thy father, and reject not the precepts of thy mother,"[24] showing that the Father—God, that is—and the Only-begotten and the Holy Spirit taught both in writing and in unwritten form. But our mother the church had precepts which she kept inviolate, and which cannot be broken. (3) Now since these precepts have been ordained in the church, and are suitable, and all of them marvelous, this fraud is confounded in his turn.

8,4 But let us pass him by too, as though we had squashed a dung or blister-beetle, or the bug we call a buprestis, < and >, on the foundation

---

[20] See Const. Apost. 8.12.43, and the Liturgies of Chryostom and. St. Basil, Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern*, pp. 230–232.

[21] Matt 27:52–53.

[22] John 3:13.

[23] John 20:19.

[24] Prov 1:8.

of the church and with God's power, go on once more to the rest, calling on God for aid.

Against Anomoeans.[1] *56, but 76 of the Series*

1,1 Again, some have been called Anomoeans. These are of recent origin. Their founder was a deacon named Aetius, who was advanced because of his foolishness by George of Alexandria.[2] George was the bishop of the Arians and Melitians at once and, as I have already indicated, was paraded through the city on a camel during the reign of Julian.[3] (2) And first he was surrounded by the Greeks and badly mistreated, and was paraded, as I said, and beaten with cudgels, but was then dragged through almost the whole town, and this is how he died. After his death he was burned, reduced to ashes together with the bones of many domestic and wild animals, and then scattered to the four winds by the pagans, and this was the last of him.[4]

1,3 Should one say of a man who died like that, "Well, he became a martyr by undergoing these sufferings at the hands of the pagans?" Indeed, if his ordeal had been for the truth's sake, and the pagans had done this to him from envy and because of his confession of Christ, he would truly have ranked as a martyr, and no minor one. (4) The confession of Christ, however, was not the reason for his death. It was the great violence he had inflicted on the city and people during his so-called episcopate, if you please, sometimes by robbing people of their patrimony, < sometimes by levying unjust taxes* >.

1,5 And not to inform on the man—for he did a number of things to the Alexandrians. For example, he expropriated the entire nitre tax; and he thought of a way of controlling the papyrus and reed marshes and the salt marshes, and getting them for himself. (6) He overlooked no shameful way of making money by many methods, even small things. For instance, he thought of limiting the number of biers[5] for the bodies of the dying,

---

[1] Reproduced in full in this Sect is the Syntagmation of Aetius the Anomoean, *On the Ingenerate God and the Generate*, at 11–12. 54,23–31 seem to reflect personal debate between Epiphanius and some Anomoeans.

[2] Cf. Theodore bar Khōni in Pognon pp. 196–198. However, according to Philost. 3.17 and Soc. 2.35.5, Aetius was ordained deacon in Antioch by Leontius.

[3] Hist. Aceph. 85; Soc. 3.2.10.

[4] Soz. 5.7.3; Philost. 7.2.

[5] Amidon: "instituting a certain number of litter bearers for the bodies of the deceased."

and without his appointed officials no dead man's body, especially not strangers' bodies, could be carried out for burial. This was not for hospitality's sake, but, as I said, to support himself. (7) For if anyone buried a body on his own, he ran a risk. In this way George made a profit on every corpse that was buried. And I pass over the other things the man got for himself through luxuries < and in other dreadful ways* >, and by cruelty.

1,8 Thus because of all this the Alexandrians who cherished anger against him, the pagans most of all, inflicted this end on him. But my reason for saying how the Alexandrians destroyed him like this as soon as they heard of Constantius' death, is simply because of Aetius, whom George made a deacon.

2,1 They say that even by worldly standards Aetius was uneducated until his manhood.[6] (2) But he stooped to attending the lectures of an Aristotelian philosopher and sophist at Alexandria[7] and learning their dialectic, if you please, for no other purpose than to give a figurative representation of the divine Word. < But > he devoted full time to the project, getting up at dawn and keeping at it till evening, I mean at discussing and defining God via a sort of geometry and in figures of speech, and at teaching and perfecting his doctrine. (3) As an Arian of the deepest dye and a holder of Arius' insane doctrine, he became the more destructive by devoting his time to these things, and sharpening his tongue each day against the Son of God and the Holy Spirit.

2,4 He was accused by certain persons, however, and denounced to Constantius, and was banished to the Taurus.[8] Here he amplified and disclosed all of his wicked doctrine by teaching it openly, < for > after hardening himself by further shamelessness, he disgorged his heresy in full. (5) For he dared to say that the Son is unlike the Father, and not the same as the Father in Godhead.

And not that we rely on the likeness. Beyond the likeness, we know that the Son is the same as the Father, and the Father's equal, in Godhead, and not different at all. (6) Many things can be likened to God, but they are not the same as he, < or > his equals, in Godhead. For example, man is in God's image and likeness, but is not the same as God in the sense of equality. (7) And the kingdom of heaven is *like a* grain of mustard seed—

---

[6] Greg. Nys. C. Eunom. 1.36–38; Philost. 3:15–17.

[7] Soc. 2.35.6; Soz. 3.15.8.

[8] At the Council of Sirmium in 358 Aetius was banished to Pepuza in Phrygia, Philost. 4.8. He had already been in the region of the Taurus after his banishment from Antioch, Philost. 2.15.

though < a grain > is not identical with the kingdom and has no part of it—and like leaven, and ten virgins, and a householder in point of likeness, but not identical.

2,8 But as the Son is like the Father—and more than "like" him, because he is the same as the Father and his equal—my concern is not merely to prove his likeness, but < his > sameness and equality as God of God, Son of the Father, and not different from < his > essence, but begotten of him. And the same with the Holy Spirit. (9) But this fine heretic Aetius didn't even think he should regard the Son as worthy of likeness to the Father. Now I agree that I myself do not really enter upon the demonstration of the faith and the honoring of the Trinity if I rely solely on the likeness. (10) Silver is like tin too, gold is like bronze and lead like iron, and precious stones are imitated by glass; and likeness does not show nature, but resemblance.

3,1 But here I, as to the scripture which confesses the Son to be the "image of the invisible God"[9]—having carefully inquired the meaning of the sacred scripture from the divine Gift who told the Pharisees, "Ye understand neither the scriptures nor the power of God,"[10]—I understand this doctrine in a dual sense, and explain it by taking the answer to the expression's meaning from a man. (2) We speak of a man's image, and < there is one image that is like him and > one that is not like him. One image is made like him with paint, but the other is made by the identity of his essence with his begetter's. As compared with his father the newborn son represents his kind, but in the end he is found to be his likeness < by his > sameness and co-essentiality with him, and his resemblance to him. (3) And we believe in the only-begotten Son of God who is the same as the Father's Godhead and rank, and his equal because of the true image, and because of the likeness which admits of no variation but is indistinguishable, as becomes a son who is truly and co-essentially begotten of a father. And so with the Holy Spirit, because of his procession from the Father—even though he is not begotten, because the Son is an only-begotten.

3,4 But from his wish to offer further resistance to the confession of the truth, Aetius tries not even to confess the Son's likeness to the Father. (5) For the other Arians, who took their cue from Lucian and Origen and were companions of a sophist named Asterius[11] who lapsed in the

[9] Col 1:15.
[10] Matt 22:27.
[11] Cf. Ath. Syn. 18.2.

persecution under Maximian, < did not disclose the whole of their heresy about the Son* >. (6) For some < said* > that he is a < creature* >, and it has been explained in my earlier Sects that each of them declared the Son of God a creature, and taught that the Holy Spirit is the creature of a creature, while some said that even though they declared him a creature, the Son of God is like the Father. (7) But this man exposed the whole of their deception, and of his own impiety, by < displaying > with full clarity the harshness and arrogance of their doctrine of the Lord. And the truth is that the strictness of the argument of this Aetius, who is also called the "Different,"[12] can be used very justly against those who covertly introduce the notion of the Son's creaturehood.

3,8 For whatever is created is unlike its creator, even though it be made like him by grace. And however one tries to decorate this with various sorts of paint, the creator is unlike the creature—unless the representation of him is a copy and likeness which is in imitation only of his appearance. (9) And as his argument would have prevailed against those Arians who regard the Son of God and the Holy Spirit as creatures, so even later, after his excommunication by those same Arians—I mean Eudoxius,[13] Menophilus and the others—he confounded them before the emperor and said, (10) "As they believe, I believe—as they all do! But what is honest in me, they hide, and what I say openly < and > acknowledge, all these say the same, but conceal themselves." And the emperor at that time was not opposed to the Arian fabrication, but considered it orthodox, if you please! But since he declined to confess the Son of God a creature, the emperor was annoyed and, as I have already said, sent < him > into exile.[14]

4,1 That was the origin of the sect, and from the one proposition the man was inspired to a great production of evils, and dealt fearful wounds to his own soul, and his converts'. (2) For he was so deluded—he and his disciples—as to say, "I understand God perfectly in this way, and understand and know him so well that I don't know myself any better than I know God!"

4,3 But I have heard as many things about him, the fearful way in which the devil contrived, through him, to destroy the souls of the people he had caught. (4) Indeed, they take no account of holiness of life,

---

[12] ἀνόμοιος.
[13] Philost. 8.4; 9.3.
[14] Soz. 4.23.4.

fasts, God's commandments, or any of God's other ordinances for men's salvation,[15] but only say glibly that they < have > it all through one text. (5) It is as though someone had lightened ship and completely jettisoned the whole cargo, but had kept just one article of the ship's freight, a jar or some other thing, to get himself across the whole sea and ensure his safety with one implement. But if he was wrong, and did not get what he expected from the implement he kept, he would drown afterwards, and thus lose the whole business and his life as well. (6) Thus both Aetius and his Anomoeans cite the Lord's words in the Gospel and repeat the expression without properly grasping the meaning, and they are wrong. (7) For when someone falls in with them and reminds them of the commandments, they claim that, as the text is worded, there is nothing else that God requires of us but simply to know him. This is what Christ meant, they say, by saying, "Grant them, Father, to have life in themselves. And this is life, that they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."[16]

4,8 Indeed, some people have told me what they distinctly heard him say when certain persons were charged with having been caught in a sexual offense, and were found guilty by them. He was not annoyed at this and even made an idle jest and said that something like this is not important; it is a physical need and the way of meeting it. (9) "When we itch by our ear," he said—I myself am embarrassed to repeat what < the > filthy man told them—"we take a feather or straw," he said, "and scratch our ear, and get rid of the itching by our ear. This too happens naturally," he said, "and if someone does it he doesn't commit a sin."

5,1 Aetius made as many such remarks, and all his teachings are lax and wicked, so that what he is may be seen from his works themselves. But the Lord's words have made this abundantly clear to us, (2) as he said, "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?"[17] Thus the utter impudence of his stupidity is exposed in the second phrase and the first. (3) [We are shown] how he opened his mouth in impudence against his Master and was not ashamed to blaspheme his Lord, and the wise will

[15] NHC Gr. Pow. 40,3–6, "Cease from the evil lusts and desires and (the teachings of) the Anomoeans, evil heresies that have no basis," is sometimes interpreted as a reference to Anomoean laxity.

[16] Cf. John 17:2–3.

[17] Matt 7:15–16.

test him by the fruits of his licentiousness and laxity, and not harvest his fruit. There is no cutting of a cluster from thorns, making holiness appear even from false doctrine.

5,4 But this is what I have heard of the events of his life. However, there are many words which, as I said, he dared to say in consequence of the madness of his rebellion against the Lord, and I shall give a few examples, and make the replies to them myself which the Lord gives me in refutation. (5) Here are the nonsense of "Different's" faith, and these are the "likenesses" of the words he quotes from scripture. They do not mean what he thinks, but he takes them that way although they mean something else.

6,1 He says at the very outset, "The Ingenerate cannot be like the Generate. Indeed, they differ in name; the one is 'ingenerate,' the other, 'generate.' " (2) But this is perfectly silly and has simply driven the man insane. If, to avoid losing the true view of Christ, we are to require an engenderer of the Ingenerate, there will no longer be one Father, or < one > father of a Father; we will need an infinite number of fathers' fathers. And there will [no longer] be one God, who is forever, has nothing before him, and endures and abides forever, of whom the only-begotten true Son is begotten and is, and of whom is his Holy Spirit. The gods we need will be many, and the whole will turn out to be imposture, not truth.

6,3 But we must know that, as the fact is, there is one God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom is the Holy Spirit who "proceeds from the Father and receives of the Son."[18] (4) And this is the one Godhead—one God, one Lord, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The Son is not identical with the Father and neither is the Holy Spirit, but the Father is a father, the Son, a son, and the Holy Spirit, a holy spirit [They are] three Perfects, one Godhead, one God, one Lord, as I have ascribed this praise to God many times, in every Sect.

6,5 Now since God is one, and no one can suppose that there is another God besides the one, the Father is wondrously both ingenerate and uncreated; and God's only-begotten Son, < who > is begotten of him, is not unlike him in any way. He is the same as and perfectly equal to the Father in rank, even though he is generate and the Father ingenerate. (6) For if the Father has begotten any Son of himself, it is impossible that [the Son] not be the Father's equal, and not be like him. Whatever begets, begets its like—and not only its like, but its equal in sameness. (7) A man begets

[18] John 15:26; 16:14.

a man, and God begets God. The man begets through sexual intercourse, but God has begotten an Only-begotten alone, in an ineffable manner. [He has not done this] by overflow, contraction or expansion; the Father, who is spirit, has begotten the Son of himself without beginning and not in time, altogether his like and equal. As the holy Gospel says, "The Jews sought to kill him, because he had not only broken the Sabbath, but said that he was the Son of God, making himself *equal* with God."[19]

6,8 How can the Son not be like the Father and entirely his equal when he has life in himself, and says, "As the Father raiseth the dead, even so the Son raiseth the dead,"[20] and, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father?"[21] (9) He cannot be different when he identifies the Father through himself and says, "He that knoweth me, knoweth the Father,"[22] and, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," meaning that he is not different from the Father. And the Father means the Son < when he says >,[23] "Let us make man in our image and after our likeness."[24] (10) If the Son were not like the Father, how could man be made in *[their]* image and likeness? The Father did not say, "Let us make man in *my* image" or in" *your* image," but, "in *our* image." (11) By saying, "our," he indicated the equality with the Father that is in the Son—and not only his likeness, but his sameness in all ways, without any difference.

7,1 But as I have already said, how can he not be the Father's equal and like the Father, he who says, "I am in the Father and the Father in me?"[25] (2) For not only does he say this himself in the Gospel. Isaiah, prophesying in the Holy Spirit, knew that the Son is in the Father and is not other than, or different from the Father, (3) as the verse which implies this says in Hebrew: "phthoou saareim, ouiabo goi sadik, somer emmourteim, iesro samoch, thesaar salom salom, shi bak batoou betou baadonai ada oth, chi baia adonai sor olemeim."[26] (4) In Aquila's version it says, "Open the gates, let the righteous nation enter that keepeth faith, the creation firmly established, the keeping of peace, for in him have they trusted. Trust ye in the Lord forever, for in the Lord is the Lord who established the ages." (5) In the Septuagint's it says, "Open the gates, let < a righteous nation >

[19] John 5:18.
[20] John 5:21.
[21] John 14:9.
[22] This is not in the NT; Epiphanius' memory is at fault.
[23] Lietzmann τὸν υἱὸν σημαίνει <λέγων>, Holl πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν <λέγων>.
[24] Gen 1:26.
[25] John 14:20.
[26] This is a Greek transliteration of the Masoretic Text of Isa 26:2.

enter that preserveth truth, and layeth claim to truth and keepeth peace. For in thee have they trusted forever, O Lord, God the great, the eternal." (6) The reader should note that in the Septuagint "God" stands in the place of "the Lord," and "the great" in place of "in the Lord."

7,7 And how much is there to say about this? I am afraid of prolonging my treatment of these words to a burdensome length. Everything in the sacred scripture is clear, to those who will approach God's word with pious reason, and not harbor the devil's work within them and turn their steps to the pits of death—as this unfortunate man and his converts have attacked the truth more vigorously than any who have become blasphemers of God and his faith before them.

7,8 < I have shown > that the Son cannot be unlike the Father, but have said that I do not rely on this either. The Son is not only "like," but equal, the same in Godhead, the same in eternity and power. And yet we do not say, "tautoousion," or the expression that some use might be compared with Sabellius. (9) We say that he is the same in Godhead, essence and power, and in all ways the equal of the Father and his Holy Spirit And we say "homoousion" as the holy faith teaches, so that the perfections are clearly indicated by "homo;" for the Son is the perfect Son of a perfect father, and the Holy Spirit is perfect as well.

8,1 These people will be detected by a first, a second, and a third piece of evidence. If it is admitted that a < Son > has been begotten by him at all, it will be admitted that the Son must be like his Begetter. (2) It is plain that Aetius calls him by the name, "Offspring," but holds and believes him < to be > a creature, though he is called a "Son" by grace—as the surveyor of the realms of the heavens, divider of the indivisible, and measurer of our salvation in Christ, has seen fit to call him. (3) But the argument of all these people who covertly introduce the doctrine of the creaturehood of Christ falls flat, as Aetius' will. (4) For I shall say to him with perfect justice, "Tell me, Mister, what can you say of the Son of God? Do you call him a creature, or an offspring? If you say he is a creature, stop hiding your outrage with plausible-sounding language by terming him the Father's Offspring! (5) Nothing that is created, is 'begotten'; and if it is begotten, it is not created. Never mind even saying 'begotten!' You have no business pronouncing the words of the truth even with one expression. Tell us your whole scheme so that we may learn who you are and escape your plot, you fisher for souls, you schemer against those who trust you! (6) Come on, do you worship the Son of God, or don't you?"

"Yes," says Aetius, "I worship him."

"Do you worship him as God, or not?"

"Yes," he says, "I worship him as God."

"Then what kind of a God can be creature, as you say he is, and still be worshiped?"

8,7 For suppose that God, who is fit to be worshiped, made the one creature and consented that he be worshiped, but their creator did not want any of the others worshiped and instead censured the worshipers of a creature, teaching them by Law, "Thou shalt not make to thyself any likeness, and thou shalt not worship it, neither in heaven, nor in earth, nor in the waters."[27] (8) And the apostle says, "They worshiped the creature more than the creator, and were made fools."[28] Why did God forbid the worship of all creatures, < but consent that this one be worshiped? > Is there "respect of persons with God,"[29] then? Never! (9) By the fact that this One is worshiped, God has shown, in every way, that the One who is worshiped is different from the creature and that the creature which is worshiped is different from the Lord, who is fit for worship—the Son of God, begotten of the Father. For because he is begotten of him, he is like him and is his Son. He is therefore fit for the worship of all: "Through him God made all things, and without him was not anything made."[30] (10) For by him, and by the Holy Spirit who "proceeds from the Father and receives of the Son,"[31] God made and established all things. "By the Word of the Lord were the heavens established, and all the host of them by the Spirit of his mouth."[32]

8,11 When the Only-begotten, as I mentioned above, said, "that they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent,"[33] he distinguished himself from creation, as the apostle says, "one God, of whom are all things, and we through him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him."[34] (12) And you see how he showed that there is one God, the Father, but one Lord, the Son begotten of him. And he didn't say, "one God, and one Lord together with all God's creatures," but, "one Lord, through whom are all things." But if there is one

---

27 Exod 20:4.
28 Rom 1:25.
29 Rom 2:11.
30 Cf. John 1:3.
31 John 15:26; 16:14.
32 Ps 32:6.
33 John 17:3.
34 1 Cor 8:6.

Lord through whom are all things, he is not one of them all, but the maker of all, the creator of all created things.

9,1 But since he through whom are all things is the Son, begotten of the Father and the Father's offspring, then, as befits the creator of all things, he is unlike them all. (2) Since God the Father, of whom are all things, [is called] "one," and the "Lord Jesus by whom are all things" [is called] "one," the text just mentioned has clearly shown that the Son is of the Father, since it is tied together by the "one" and the "one," and by "of whom" and "by whom." But by saying, "by whom are all things," it has declared wonderfully well that the Son "by whom are all things" cannot be one of the rest, showing that there is a Father, and there is a Son—the only-begotten Lord—of the One who is the Father.

9,3 But the apostle was saying these things by the Holy Spirit's inspiration; he therefore did not need to give any proof of the Spirit. This was not because the Spirit is not glorified with the Father and the Son, or to designate him as one of all the things created through the Son. (4) It was enough that the Spirit was included with the Father and the Son in the Son's sure confession, "Go baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."[35] So when the apostle spoke—or rather, when the Holy Spirit spoke in him—he said nothing about himself. The knowledge of him was clear, and undisputed by the Jews; but it was treasured up [rather than published], so that the Holy Spirit would not be the one to commend himself. (5) But the apostle was inspired by the Holy Spirit and spoke of the Father and the Son, to show that the Holy Trinity is eternal, and never ceases to be.

But don't be surprised if you hear, "one *God*, of whom are all things, and one *Lord*, by whom are all things."[36] (6) By calling the Son, "Lord," the apostle by no means denied his Lordship and Godhead. And by saying, "one God, of whom are all things," he did not deny God's Godhead and Lordship. "Lord" goes together with "God" and "God" with "Lord," and this will make no difference to the tidings which God has truly proclaimed to us through the apostles, for our salvation.

9,7 But by a clumsy construction of God's oracles this Different and his followers have turned the way of the truth < to falsehood >. In the end, through distracting their minds with debate and verbal arguments, they have turned their backs on the truth and been deprived of the heav-

[35] Matt 28:19.
[36] 1 Cor 8:6.

enly realms. (8) For—if they are willing to pay attention to "the light of the Gospel"[37]—every word will convict them. Though the Only-begotten surely came in the flesh, he nowhere says, "The Father who created me hath sent me." Nor did the Father ever say, in the Gospel or the Old Testament, "I have created the Son for you." [We read], "The Father hath sent me,"[38] "I came forth from the Father and am come,"[39] and, "He who is in the bosom of the Father,"[40] and, "The Word was with God, and the Word was God."[41] (9) And there is much that we can learn about our salvation, and not be carried away with this devil's tricky teaching.

9,10 For, consumed with envy at man's glory, the devil is out to destroy mankind, and has devised various schemes. The first was through ignorance, the second through idolatry, another time it was through vice—but now, at length, it is through the error and imposture of the sects, to turn man away from the heavens by every possible method.

10,1 How much my poor mind will find to say to you, Different! It is quite true that you are "Different"; you have made your way of life and your thinking different from those who have the understanding of God and hold the faith of the truth. (2) You have not become different from other people by your progress in goodness; you have become different from the sons of God's church by abandoning the way of the truth. By taking as your excuse the Son of God who is like his Father and calling him "different from" the Father, you have become "different" and been awarded this title, since you are no longer like those who are to be saved in God.

10,3 But now then, not to waste my time in investigating him, let me refute him from the things he said himself to certain persons in a dialectical communication. (4) For it seems that he gave some indication of his mistakes in argument in his treatise itself—which contains not one word of faith which is wholly innocent and pure faith, and ordered in the Holy and meek Spirit. (5) First, I set down in full the work which seems to be his, which has come into my possession, to use it against him for the rest of the refutation of his treatise. The work is as follows:

---

37 2 Cor 4:4.
38 John 10:36.
39 John 8:42.
40 John 1:18.
41 John 1:1.

The Treatise of "The Different" Aetius

11,1 *During the time of my persecution by the Temporists*[42] *some of them, among many other things, appropriated a brief treatise concerning the Ingenerate God and the Generate which I had composed with particular effort, corrupted it with insertions and omissions and issued it, after altering the sequence of the argument. It fell into my hands afterwards because one of the virtuous brought it to me,* (2) *and I have been obliged, like a father, to correct the treatise again and send it to you, all you male and female champions of piety, to show you that the brief discourse accords with the sense of the holy scriptures. With its help you will be able, with brief counter-arguments, to put a stop to the impudence of everyone—these Temporists most of all—who tries to contradict you about the Ingenerate God and the Generate.*

11,3 *For the ready comprehension and the clarity of my arguments I have separated objection from objection and solution from solution in the form of short paragraphs, and have begun with the Ingenerate God,*

12,1 *Whether it is possible for the Ingenerate God to make a generate thing ingenerate:*

2.[43] *If the Ingenerate God transcends every cause, he therefore must also transcend origination. But if he [indeed] transcends every cause he plainly transcends origination also. For he neither received his existence from another nature nor provided himself with existence.*

3. *But if, not from the inadequacy of his nature but because of his transcendence of every cause, he did not provide himself with existence, how can anyone concede that there is no difference of essence between the nature that is provided with existence and the nature that provides it, when such a nature [as the first] does not admit of origination?*

4. *If God remains forever ingenerate and his Offspring forever an Offspring the heresy of the homoousion and the homoeousion will be brought to an end. The essential incomparability [of the two] remains, since either nature remains endlessly in the rank proper to its nature.*

---

[42] "Temporist" is a pejorative term for catholic. Epiphanius takes it to mean that the catholic position on the Trinity is accused of having an origin recent in time. Athanasius, Dial. II Trin. 11, takes it to mean that catholics are accused of teaching that the Son was begotten in time.

[43] Aetius' numbers serve as the paragraph numbers of Epiphanius' chapter 12.

5. *If God is ingenerate in essence, the Generate was not produced by a separation of essence, but God gave it being by virtue of his authority.*[44] *For no pious reason can allow that the same essence can be both generate and ingenerate.*

6. *If the Ingenerate was generated, what is there to prevent the Generate from having become ingenerate? For on the contrary, every nature is urged < away from > that which is not natural to it toward that which is.*

7. *If God is not wholly ingenerate, there is nothing to prevent his having generated as an essence. But since God is wholly ingenerate, there was no separation of his essence for the purpose of generation, but he brought an Offspring into existence by his authority.*

8. *If the Ingenerate God is wholly generative, the Offspring was not generated as an essence, since God's essence is wholly generative and not generated. But if God's essence has been transformed and is called an Offspring, God's essence is not unalterable, since the transformation brought about the formation of the Son. But if God's essence is both unalterable and above generation, talk of "sonship" will admittedly be a mere verbal ascription.*

9. *If the Offspring was in the Ingenerate God in germ, he was "brought to maturity," after his generation, as we might say, by receiving accretions from without. Therefore the Son is not "mature" because of the causes of his generation, but because of the accretions he received. For things which receive accretions genetically, in the sense of being constituted by them, are characteristically termed "mature" in a distinctive way.*

10. *If the Offspring was full grown in the Ingenerate, it is an Offspring by virtue of properties which were in the Ingenerate,*[45] *and not by virtue of those with which the Ingenerate generated it. [But this cannot be], for there can be no generacy in ingenerate essence; the < same > thing can< not > both be and not be. An offspring is not ingenerate, and if it were ingenerate it would not be an offspring, for to say that God is not homogeneous is to offer him sheer blasphemy and insult.*

11. *If Almighty God, whose nature is ingenerate, knows that his nature is not generate, but the Son, whose nature is generate, knows that he is what he is, how can the homoousion not be a lie? For the one knows himself to be ingenerate, but the other, generate.*

---

[44] Wickham ἐξουσίᾳ ὑπέστησαν αὐτό, Holl & MSS; ἐξ οὐσίας ὑποστησάσης.

[45] Wickham: ἐξ ὧν ἦν ἐν (τω) ἀγεννήτῳ γέννημα ἐστὶ, Holl, Amidon, MSS: ἐν γεννητῷ γέννημα ἐστι.

12. *If ingeneracy does not represent the reality of God but the incomparable name is of human invention, God owes the inventors thanks for their invention of the concept of ingeneracy, since in his essence he does not have the superiority the name implies.*

13. *If ingeneracy is only something external observers observe to be God's, the observers are better than the One observed, for they have given him a name which is better than his nature.*

14. *If ingeneracy is not susceptible of generation, this is what we maintain. But if it is susceptible of generation, the sufferings of generation must be superior to the real nature of God.*

15. *If the Offspring is unchangeable by nature because of its Begetter, then the Ingenerate is an unchangeable essence, not because of its will, but because of its essential rank.*

16. *If "ingeneracy" is indicative of essence, it may properly be contrasted with the essence of the Offspring. But if "ingeneracy" means nothing, all the more must "Offspring" mean nothing.*

But how < could > nothing be contrasted with nothing? If the expression, "ingenerate," is contrasted with the expression, "generate," but silence succeeds the expression, the hope of Christians may well begin and end [there], since it rests in a particular expression, and not in natures which are such as the meaning of their names imply.

17. *If the term, "ingenerate," as against the term, "offspring " contributes nothing toward superiority of essence, the Son, who is [therefore] surpassed only verbally,*[46] *will know that those who have termed him, "Son," are his betters, and not He who is termed his "God and Father."*

18. *If the ingenerate essence is superior, and innately superior, it is ingenerate essence per se.*[47] *For it is not superior to generation deliberately, because it so wills, but because this is its nature. Since ingenerate nature per se is God, it allows no reasoning to think of*[48] *generation in connection with it and resists all examination and reasoning on the part of generate beings.*

19. *If "ingenerate," when applied to God, connotes privation but "ingenerate" must be nothing, what reasoning can take away nothing from a nonexistent thing? But if it means something that is, who can separate God from being, that is, i.e., separate him from himself?*

---

[46] Holl, Amidon, MSS ὑπερεχομένους, Wickham without explanation ὑπερεχόμενος.
[47] Wickham, Codex Jenensis αὐτὸ οὐσία, Holl, MSS αὐτοουσία.
[48] Holl tentatively, Wickham παρά, MSS κατά.

20. *If the "privations" of states are the removals of them, "ingenerate" as applied to God is either the privation of a state, or a state of privation. But if "ingenerate" is the privation of a state, how can something God does not have be counted as one of his attributes? If "ingenerate" is a state, however, a generate essence must be assumed to precede it, so that it may acquire the [new] state and be called, "ingenerate." If, however, the generate essence partook of an ingenerate essence [to begin with], it has been deprived of its generation*[49] *by undergoing the loss of a state.*

Generacy must then be an essence but ingeneracy a state. But if "offspring" implies a coming to be, it is plain that the word means a state, whether the Offspring is made out of some essence, or whether it is what it is called, an "Offspring."

21. *If "ingeneracy" is a state and "generacy" is a state, the essences*[50] *are prior to the states; but even though the states are secondary to the essences, they are more important.*

Now if ingeneracy is the cause of generacy and means that there is an offspring which implies the cause of its own being, "offspring" denotes an essence, not a state. < On the other hand >, since ingeneracy implies nothing besides itself, how can the ingenerate nature be not an essence, but a state?

22. *If every essence is ingenerate like Almighty God's, how can one say that one essence is subject to vicissitudes while another is not? But if the one essence remains above quantity and quality and, in a word, all sorts of change because of its classification as ingenerate, while the other is subject to vicissitudes < and yet > is admitted to have something unchangeable in its essence, we ought to attribute the characteristics of these essences to chance, or, as is at any rate*[51] *logical, call the active essence ingenerate, but the essence which is changed, generate?*[52]

23. *If the ingenerate nature is the cause of the nature that has come to be, and yet "ingenerate" is nothing, how can nothing be the cause of a thing that has come to be'?*

24. *If "ingenerate" is a privation but a privation is the loss of a state, and if a "loss" is completely destroyed or changed to something else, how can*

---

[49] The translation of this clause is problematical. Wickham: "It thrusts aside all burden of inquiry and reasoning from generate beings;" so, approximately, Amidon.

[50] Wickham: γενέσεως, Holl, Amidon, MSS: ἀγεννεσίας.

[51] Wickham ἢ τὸ γε οὖν, Holl and MSS ἢ τὸ γοῦν.

[52] Wickham τῷ αὐτομάτῳ ἐπιτρέψαι ὀφείλομεν τὰ κατὰ τὰς προειρρημένας, Holl and MSS τῶ αὐτομάτῳ ἐπιτρέψαι τὸν φιλοῦντα κατὰ τὰ προειρημένα.

the essence of God be named for a changing or vanishing state by the title, "ingenerate?"

25. *If "ingenerate" denotes privation, which is not an attribute of God, why do we say that God is ingenerate but not generate?*

26. *If, as applied to God, "ingenerate" is a mere name, but the mere expression elevates the being of God over against all generate things, then the human expression is worth more than the being of the Almighty, since it has embellished God the Almighty with incomparable superiority.*

27. *If there is a cause to correspond with everything generate but the ingenerate nature has no cause, "ingenerate" does not denote a cause but means an entity.*

28. *If whatever is made, is made by something, but ingenerate being is made neither by itself nor by something else, "ingenerate" must denote essence.*

29. *If the ingenerate being is implicitly indicated to be the cause of the Offspring's existence and, in contrast with every [other] cause, is invariable, it is incomparable essence in itself*[53] *and its matchlessness is not implied for any reason external to itself but because, being ingenerate, it is incomparable and matchless in itself.*[54]

30. *If the Almighty surpasses every nature, he surpasses it because of his ingeneracy, and this is the reason for the permanence of generate things. But if "ingenerate" does not denote an essence, how will the nature of generate things be preserved?*

31. *If no invisible thing preexists itself in germ, but each remains in the nature allotted to it, how can the Ingenerate God, who is free from any category, sometimes see his own essence in the Offspring as secondary but sometimes see it in ingeneracy as prior, on the principle of "first and second."*

32. *If God retains an ingenerate nature, there can be no question of his knowing himself as [both] originated and unoriginated. If, on the other hand, we grant that his essence continues to be ingenerate and generate, he does not know his own essence, since his head is in a whirl from origination and non-origination. But if the Generate too partakes of ingenerate nature and yet remains without cessation in his generate nature, he knows himself in the nature in which he continues to remain, but plainly does not know his participation in ingeneracy; for he cannot possibly be aware of himself as both of ingenerate and of generate essence.*

---

[53] Wickham: ἢ τὸ γε οὖν Holl and MSS ἢ τὸ γοῦν.

[54] Wickham: ὥσπερ οὖν ἐστί Holl and MSS ὥσπερ οὐκ εστί.

If, however, the Generate is contemptible because of his proneness to change, then unchangeable essence is a natural rank, since the essence of the Ingenerate admittedly transcends every cause.

33. *If the Ingenerate transcends all cause, but there are many ingenerates they will [all] be exactly alike in nature. For without being endowed with some quality common [to all], while yet having some quality of its own—[a condition not possible in ingenerate being]—one ingenerate nature would not make, while another was made.*

34. *If every essence is ingenerate, one will not differ from another in self-determination. How, then, can we say that one [such] being is changed and another causes change, when we will not allow God to bring them into being from an essence that has no [prior] existence?*

35. *If every essence is ingenerate, every one is exactly alike. But the doing and suffering of an essence that is exactly like [all the others] must be attributed to chance. However, if there are many ingenerates which are exactly alike, there can be no enumeration of their ways of differing from one another. For there could be no enumerations of their differences, either in general or in some respect, since every difference which implies classification is already excluded from an ingenerate nature.*

36. *If "ingenerate" and "God" are exact parallels and mean the same thing, the Ingenerate begot an Ingenerate. But if "ingenerate" means one thing while "God" means something else, there is nothing strange in God's begetting God, since one of the two receives being from ingenerate essence. But if, as is the case,*[55] *that which is before God is nothing, "ingenerate" and "God" do mean the same, for "Offspring" does not admit of ingeneracy. Thus the Offspring does not allow himself to be mentioned in the same breath with his God and Father.*

12,37 *May the true God, who is ingenerate in himself and for this reason is alone addressed as "the only true God" by his messenger, Jesus Christ, who truly came into being before the ages and is truly a generate entity, preserve you, men and women, from impiety, safe and sound from impiety in Christ Jesus our Savior, through whom be all glory to our God and Father, both now and forever, and to the ages of ages. Amen.*

The end of Aetius' treatise

13,1 And this, as I said, is the beginning of my refutation of his corrupt passages, part of which have come into my possession. (For they say that,

[55] Wickham αὐτὸ ἀγέννητος; Dummer: αὐτοαγέννητος which is synonymous; Holl and MSS αὐτογέννητος. The last cannot be what Aetius wrote but is certainly what Epiphanius read, cf. 54,2.

in all, he composed 300 other paragraphs like these, filled with impiety.) (2) But I publish the treatise here for scholarship's sake, if you like, as though a snake's body were decaying and rotting, and a good man had gathered up the bones of the carcass of the snake whose treachery might do harm to somebody. Aetius boasts of having put this treachery into writing for "certain persons," and his treatise begins as follows. (3) But < by > God's inspiration let me prepare a preventative antidote because of it, for those who would like to be cured of his poison, by culling out the medicines of the words of the sacred scripture, from the beginning [of the treatise] until its end. I shall place my refutations next to each passage in these paragraphs of syllogistic reasoning, as follows:

14,1 *During my persecution by the Temporists some of them, among many other things, appropriated a brief treatise I had composed with particular effort on the subject of the Ingenerate God and the Generate, corrupted it with insertions and omissions, and issued it after altering the sequence of the argument. It fell into my hands afterwards because one of the virtuous brought it to me,* (2) *and I have been obliged, like a father, to correct the treatise again and send it to you, all you male and female champions of piety, to show you that the brief discourse accords with the sense of the holy scriptures. With its help you will be able, with brief counter-arguments, to put a stop to the impudence of everyone—these Temporists most of all—who tries to contradict you about the Ingenerate God and the Generate.*

14,3 *For the ready comprehension and the clarity of my arguments I have separated objection from objection and solution from solution in the form of short paragraphs, and have begun with the Ingenerate God.*

15,1 Whether you think they are lengthy, or indeed, brief, I shall give the refutation of the exact words of your pompous dialectic and uselessly laborious syllogisms, without either omitting or repeating the endless number of the passages. (2) And in the first place, you wrote to the "male and female champions" of your connection [in the words I have given] above, and said that certain 'Temporists" had appropriated the portion of your treatise that was then in your hands, < and had corrupted > it. But < going by > your expression which we find here,[56] < one > would sooner convict you and your disciples—not to say, your dupes—of bearing this name.

15,3 For God's holy faith, which was there from the beginning and yet never grows old, is always in existence. Its foundation has been estab-

[56] Holl διὰ τῆς ἐφευρεθείσης παρά σοι λέξεως; <τις>, MSS ἐρωτηθεὶς παρά σοι λέξεως.

lished and it has its Master, who is not in time. Hence it is not temporal; it is forever, shares the citizenship of the angels, and adorns the saints in every generation. (4) No, you're the temporist! You have been fed on imposture and become vain in mind, and mix your fodder indiscriminately with the flock's thorny pasturage. For none of the ancients held your views, Aetius—you who write against the "temporal," but are "temporal" yourself, and of no ancient origin. (5) But at the very beginning of your introduction, when you said you had written the little book, you startled the world in the terribly brilliant introduction to your work by saying, "Ingenerate and Generate God"[57]—excuse my making fun of your use of the terms of such a lengthy coinage of new names.

16,1 For what Christian, in possession of God's saving message, would desert this–would be inspired by your mythological fiction to come, leaving the eternal God and his eternal Spirit, hear from you about a "generate God," and make a fool of himself by learning to "worship the creature more than the creator, who is blessed forever. Amen?"[58] (2) We have no created God, no manufactured God, but One who is uncreated and unoriginate, begotten of the Father without beginning and not in time. (3) For even though you play games with "generate" and choose to make "generate" a synonym [for "begotten"], I shall not accept your expression even if you mean no less by it than "begotten of the Father." "Men do not gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles,"[59] and a correct statement is not to be expected from a man who is in error. The Lord silenced the demons too, when they confessed that he was Christ.

But you claim that your dinky little book is in accordance with the sense of the sacred scriptures. (4) Tell me, which sacred scripture ever taught the worship of a created God? As to God's being "ingenerate," we can all see that. (5) But even this is not in the sacred scripture in so many words; we fitly think and say this with piety on the basis of correct and godly reasoning and our understanding of God itself.

16,6 But you say that you arranged your propositions as a short, simple statement in the form of short paragraphs, so that the male and female champions, as you call them—(dupes, actually)—will know how to answer everyone. (7) Therefore, though I am nobody, stupid, and not important but worth far less than many in God's holy church, I < shall take up >

[57] So Epiphanius appears to understand Aetius' title. See below at 16,1–2.
[58] Rom 1:25.
[59] Matt 7:16.

those remarks which you think are weighty and clever, and which you have worked up as a reply to important people—or rather, as your shout against the truth—and, as I said, give the refutation of this incoherent, completely worthless nonsense of yours.

17,1 And this will do as my modest response to your prologue. But [next] I shall insert your propositions, one after another, and beside each statement and proposition put the answers to and refutations of your syllogistic arguments, so that God's servants and true champions, reading this and learning the whole of your absurdity, can laugh at it, saying "The haughtiness of thine heart"[60] has made this for you. (2) "For thou didst say in thine heart, I shall ascend to heaven, and above the stars of heaven will I set my throne. I shall sit on a lofty mountain; upon the lofty mountains of the north will I ascend above the clouds and be like unto the Most High. But now shalt thou descend to hades, to the foundations of the earth," and so on[61]

18,1 And this is the beginning of Aetius' propositions:

1. *Whether it is possible for the Ingenerate God to make a generate thing ingenerate:*

Refutation. First, it is impious to begin with to think of impossibility in connection with God, or the only < impossibility > is what is unsuitable to his Godhead—and this, not because he cannot do it, but because evil is unsuitable to the God for whom nothing is impossible. It is impossible for his mighty divine goodness, and for him who is good, because doing evil is impossible [to him].

18,2 And otherwise, if God regards the < making > of the ingenerate generate as a good work, but lacks the power to bring something that was going on well to a good conclusion, this must be a defect of power for God, who wants to do the better thing, but cannot. (3) But if the ingenerate is good, but the generate was well made in its own order, then, since the order of the generate is a good order which stems from a good God, and which God regards as good, God would not make a thing ingenerate which had been well generated. He would be satisfied with its being good in its own way.

18,4 Therefore, since the order of a good thing is not unchanged because it cannot be changed, but because it is good that it be as it is, the

[60] Obad 3.
[61] Isa 14:13–15.

ingenerate God is good. And the things he makes are good in their own order, without taking the name of "ingenerate."

For God did not make created "gods," so that one could be equated with the other and remove the opposition between "greater" and "lesser" by the title, ["god"]. (5) If the one is an ingenerate God and the other a generate God, since their natures have nothing in common the generate God cannot by his nature share < in > the rank of the name [of God], except by a kindly intended misuse of the word—and then only if the well endowed God grants this to the lesser God by participation.

18,6 But the lesser God would never call himself by the greater God's name, but knows that he is entirely ineligible to have the natural rank and title. Someone ought to tell you, "The Word *was* God,"[62] Aetius—not, "The Word *became* God." If indeed the Word "became" anything, how will he get < the > title of nobility by nature, or how will he be made equal to God's rank? Or how can the phrase, "was God," be got rid of? The time implied by "was" does not allow for the slightest distinction [between Gods].

18,7 But let me inform you that the God who has no beginning, the ingenerate God, begot, of himself, a God like himself—and not only like him, but in every way equal to him. (8) And he did not create him. Otherwise, since the creature had been unlike [his creator], he would have made the name "God" inapplicable because of the extent of the difference [between the two]. For the begetter cannot beget an offspring which is unlike him and not his equal, and the begotten cannot be unlike his begetter. (9) Here, then, < pious reason* > will comprehend the fact of [the Son's] sameness [as the Father] from the Gospel's text, "All that the Father hath are mine."[63] In other words: "The Father is God; I am God. The Father is life; I am life." And everything else that fits the Father < fits > the Son and the Holy Spirit in one Godhead, with no distinction between the persons of the Trinity. (10) For we are plainly assured of the perfect knowledge that the subsistent Word < has been begotten > of the Father without beginning and not in time, and that the subsistent Holy Spirit < proceeds from > the Father and < receives of > the Son.

19,1 2. *If the Ingenerate God transcends every cause, he therefore must also transcend origination. But if he [indeed] transcends every cause he plainly transcends origination also. For he neither received his existence from another nature nor provided himself with existence.*

---

[62] John 1:1.
[63] John 17:10.

19,2 *Refutation.* If the ingenerate God transcends every cause, and yet the One whom he generated was generated unworthily of him and not his equal, yet still retains the Father's transcendent name, the Offspring disgraces his Begetter by having the dignity of a name different from creatures, but not doing honor to his Maker as creatures do. (3) For the things outside of him win glory for their Maker without being their Maker's equals or having his name, but by being made as servants to their Maker's glory, so that the superiority, even to them, of Him < who > is superior to the things that have been made glorious may be observed, proportionately, from the glorious creatures. (4) If, however, the one who is not yet given their name but who has equal rank by co-essentiality with the superior Being from birth, is [still of] a different kind than the superior Being < because of > the difference between them, he will even reduce the Superior Being's rank, since the Offspring's relation to the Superior is changed. (5) The Offspring is therefore not understood by faith to be the like offspring of a like parent and equal offspring of an equal parent, on the analogy of a physical offspring, but as God of God, light of light, and the subsistent Word of the Father. The unchanging glory of the Superior is thus preserved, in that the Superior < is > not his own cause, but generates from himself the equal of his pure and incomprehensible essence—co-essentially generates the real and subsistent divine Offspring. This is not a lifeless image, but replicates the Father's kind—as, to assign equality with the Begetter to the Offspring, the sacred scripture says, "image of the invisible God."[64]

19,6 And lest it be supposed that there is a difference between image and identity, the Father himself, to provide for the restoration of our life, said, *"Let us make* man in our image and after our likeness"[65] before this last text (i.e., Col 1:15). He did not distinguish himself from the Son, but used a dual and equivocal expression, "*Let us* make man," to mean two, himself and the Son—or, indeed, I would also say the Holy Spirit. (7) And < by using the words, "in image and in likeness" > of the image's exactitude, and saying besides with two words that [the Son] is not < unlike > [the Father], he said that there is one image. But with "our" he declared that it is the image of two persons, and that the man who is being made, is not being made in the image of the one but in the likeness of the two, and is being made an exact image. This makes it entirely clear that the

[64] Col 1:15.
[65] Gen 1:26.

superiority of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit remains identical and unvarying.

19,8 For neither the Father, the Son nor the Holy Spirit has taken anything from another nature, or given another nature participation in his nature and rank. Nor did the Only-begotten and the Holy Spirit originate from the Father by an alteration of his nature, nor by division of it nor emanation from it. He has declared to us, plainly and consistently, that, as the ingenerate and uncreated nature was always superior, so a superior Offspring and Holy Spirit were always of him.

20,1 3. *But if, not from the inadequacy of his nature but because of his transcendence of every cause, he did not provide himself with existence, how can anyone concede that there is no difference of essence between the nature that provides existence and the nature that is provided with existence, when such a nature [as the first] does not admit of origination?*

20,2 *Refutation.* You should look up, Aetius, realize your pitiable condition, and put a stop to the worse than impiety of your rash notion, < or > no one will suppose that I have not caught your madness and been overawed by such temerity, but [rather] am giving godly counsel to you and myself. (3) For by supposing that, in the essentials and the things becoming to God, God is unlike and not the equal of the Son he has begotten, and by < seeing fit* > < to preach > with extreme imposture that < the* > Son < is "of" him >[66] by some holy act of creation, you are preaching, if anything, that God is like the Son in the most unsuitable ways, which do not become his Godhead.

20,4 In the first place, to think of God with such profoundly stupid irreverence is the fruit of impiety, or rather, of a diseased mind. (5) By saying that < he > is [either] his own cause, or else that he < provided > himself with existence, you, in your search and quest for the origin of God, have entangled yourself in two wicked opinions: that is, either he always provided himself with existence or he exists by chance. And when I contemplate your wicked piece of reasoning I am frightened and shake with fear. (6) Stop it! Let's stop it! It is enough for us and our piety to understand and believe that the everlasting God was always God!

Indeed, you said, as though you had bestowed a great honor on God—though in this too you speak and reason foolishly—that God neither provides himself with existence nor < is his own cause >. On your premises, then, if the preservation of the faith depends upon words and arguments,

[66] Holl: <ἡγούμενος>…ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὸν θεόν; MSS: ἐξελθεῖν θεόν.

< the divine nature would appear* > to be in a category similar to that of inferior beings and wretched bodies. (7) No creature, from bugs to man, from men to angels, is its own cause or has provided itself with existence. (8) No created thing has provided its own being; each has received the inception of its existence from the only Being who [truly] is. So since you have been < foiled > and beaten by the arguments you thought you could use, stop your unnatural effort to measure yourself against One higher than you! For you will be thwarted in every way since, even though he derives his rank from the Father < by > begetting—or by generation if you will—the Only-begotten is equal to and like the Father. (9) He will be no different from his equality with the Father because of this, just as he will be no different from his likeness because created things cannot provide themselves with being—in the same way that He who is their superior and in all ways perfect did not have his origin from anything before him. (10) For he did not begin to be, either. He was always and is always, even though he remains as he is and does not provide himself with being. We have no need of synonymous expressions, but of the consideration < which*> genuinely < makes for* > piety.

20,11 And otherwise, since you have said, "And if, not from the inadequacy of his nature but because of his transcendence of every cause, he did not provide himself with existence," learn for your own part that the Son's name cannot come from inadequacy, because he has the special fitness for it of co-essentiality with his Begetter. (12) For as transcendence of every cause is most becoming to the Father, so the same one Godhead is becoming to the only < Son > of the only Father, with the only Holy Spirit—a Godhead which, not because of its inadequacy, but because of its transcendence of each and every thing < that has been made > from nothing, cannot admit of a cause. For there is one Godhead, which is enumerated by one name, "Trinity," and is proclaimed by candidates for baptism in their one profession of the names of "Father, Son and Holy Spirit," in the words that truthfully express the equivalence of the naming of a "Father," a "Son," and a "Holy Spirit."

20,13 But again, you said, "how can one concede that there is no difference of essence between the nature that provides existence and the nature that exists, when such a nature [as the first] does not admit of origination?" And you neither understand, nor have understood, how you have deprived yourself of knowledge of God's truth, because you are not taught the truth by the Holy Spirit, but are trying to penetrate the heavens by the wisdom of this world, which has been made foolish. (14) You will

accordingly hear that [this wisdom] has been brought to naught for you: "The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise that they are vain."[67]

20,15 For He who begot the subsistent Word begot him equal to himself and not different from his Godhead because of the difference between him and the Offspring, but < in all ways like himself.* > For it would be entirely inappropriate for us to suppose that the Begetter himself has begotten the Offspring unworthily of himself, unequal to him, and inferior to the Begetter. (16) Scripture has said that all things were made through the Son, the subsistent Word, so as not to count him as a creature, but as the Father's like and equal in < everything >, as befits the name, "Father"—forever < like > Him Who Is, not strange to him but his legitimate Son, as a Son begotten of him with the same essence.

21,1 4. *If God remains forever ingenerate and his Offspring forever an Offspring the heresy of the homoousion and the homoeousion will be brought to an end. The essential incomparability [of the two] remains, since either nature remains endlessly in the rank proper to the nature.*

21,2 *Refutation.* If God remains endlessly and ceaselessly in his ingenerate nature, as you have said, but the nature of God is eternal and in ceaseless possession of its rank, not because of something else but because it is God in his very essence and eternity in its very essence, then, if you call the Offspring "endless," he must surely be co-essential with God. For you have turned round and granted the Son the title on convincing natural grounds. (3) For you will grant, and will be forced to admit, that "endless" means entirely boundless and unlimited. Very well, how can he not be co-essential [with the Father]?

Since you have seen fit to mock the truth and tried to insult it with an heretical name, < you will be > defeated by the very words you have used. (4) For you will either admit that the essence you have blasphemously termed different [from the Father's] < has > an end—or, once you have declared him "endless," you will be obliged to teach the entire unalterability of his rank and the indistinguishability of the rank of the endless [Son from that of the endless Father]. The truth will not allow that the Son has an end for, because the scripture says, "Of his kingdom there shall be no end,"[68] he rules forever with the Father and the Holy Spirit.

Whatever has a beginning will also have an end, at the pleasure of Him who provided the thing that had a beginning with being. This is admissible

[67] 1 Cor 3:20.
[68] Luke 1:32.

in all cases, but inadmissible in the case of the Son. (5) For he is forever of the God Who Is and with the God who is, and never ceases to be. Therefore he was, and will be, co-essential with the Father, an only Son of an only Father, and in no way different in essence but is as the ranks of the names imply, of a Godhead which remains identical [with the Father's], which has no amalgamation or beginning, which does not provide itself with being, and which admits of no unlikeness in itself. It is forever and never ceases to be, and is becoming to itself, for it is forever and ceaselessly in the rank of the Father of a Son, and of the Son of a Father, and of a Holy Spirit with a Father and a Son. For the Trinity cannot be compared with itself, since it admits of no distinction in rank.

22,1 5. *If God is ingenerate in essence, the Generate was not produced by a separation of essence, but God gave it being by virtue of his authority. For no pious reason can allow that the same essence is both generate and ingenerate.*

22,2 *Refutation.* You have come forward many times with your "ingenerate and generate," Mister, and brayed out God's name, and yet buried your notion of him underneath all sorts of lawlessness. For that name is an object of longing to one who is in doubt about it, and the resolution of his doubts is a consolation to the doubter, < but > if his doubts are not resolved, < he is ashamed* > even to say it. (3) And since you have no God you are < not > too proud to say this name if only to mouth it, for you have never received it in the fear of him, in faith and hope, and in love for him. (4) Otherwise it would have been enough for you to say this once, and not go beyond the allowable limit for repetition. The Savior's pronouncement about you is plain, By their fruits ye shall know them";[69] for you are dressed in a sheep's fleece, but inside it you are a disguised predator, like a wolf.

22,5 For if you were born of the Holy Spirit and a disciple of the apostles and prophets, you ought to go < looking > all the way from the Genesis of the World to the Times of Esther in the twenty-seven books of the Old Testament, which are counted as twenty-two—and in the four holy Gospels, the holy apostle's fourteen Epistles, the General Epistles of James, Peter, John and Jude and the Acts of the Apostles before their time together with their Acts during it, the Revelation of John, and the Wisdoms, I mean Solomon's and Sirach's—and, in a word, in all the sacred scriptures, and realize that you have come to us with a name, "ingenerate," which scripture never mentions. It is not inappropriate for God but

[69] Matt 7:16.

an orthodox term for him, but it is nowhere to be found in the sacred scripture, since no one < but > a madman would ever conceive of God as being generate.

22,6 But neither did they need to say that only the Father is the "ingenerate God" because his Son is generate, to avoid giving the impression that ingeneracy applies not only to the Father, but also to the Son and the Holy Spirit. Right-mindedness and the Holy Spirit teach all the sons of the truth of themselves not to be unclear about this, but to have the knowledge of God which is requisite, and which in itself belongs to < right > reasoning with regard to piety. (7) But if Anomoeans < say that* > < "ingenerate" is the proper name for God* >, since he is ingenerate—and I too agree—< I shall reply that this term is not inappropriate* >, but that they have no scriptural support for the use of the word. Piety knows of itself, by < correct > reasoning, that this < expression* > is accurate. For why will there be a difference[70] of essence < between the Ingenerate > and the Generate, if the latter really has the name because of his begetting, in some natural and ineffable sense—in a sense appropriate to God, and to the Son begotten of him without beginning and not in time, in reality and not in some accommodated sense of the word? (8) I therefore deny that his essence is created, or that it is different [from the Father's] because of being a created thing, but [maintain] that it is really begotten, and not different from its Begetter.

It thus remains not created and not made, but begotten of the very essence of God, and unaffected by time. For his true Begetter was not affected by time, so as to give being to an essence affected by time. For as is the Offspring, so is the Begetter; as is the Begetter, so is the Begotten.

23,1 6. *If the Ingenerate was generated, what is there to prevent the Generate from having become ingenerate? For on the contrary, every nature is urged < away from > that which is not natural to it toward that which is.*

23,2 *Refutation.* If the Ingenerate made < the Generate >, and did not beget him, [then], since the name [of either one] is restricted to the one identity and neither is comparable with the other because of the real opposition of their meaning, the meaning of their relationship is the difference between the one and the other. For neither has anything in common with the other save only by the authority of the superior nature, < which is > the cause of all it has created.

---

[70] διάστασις as at 22,1. The word as employed by Aetius is best rendered "separation"; Epiphanius appears to have understood it in the sense of "difference."

23,3 But since there is another term between "maker" and "made," and between "creator" and "creature"—a term close to "ingenerate" but a long way from "created"—you cannot confuse all this, Aetius, and deliberately do away with the Son's share in the perfect name, which reflects the true relation of the eternal, uncreated Son to the Father. (4) < For > an ingenerate, uncreated being can never become a creature, and change back from creaturehood and return to its ingeneracy once more, even though you construct a million Aristotelian syllogisms for us, abandoning the simple, pure heavenly teaching of the Holy Spirit.

24,1 7. *If God is not wholly ingenerate, there is nothing to prevent his having generated as an essence. But since God is wholly ingenerate, there was no separation of his essence for the purpose of generation, but he brought an Offspring into existence by his authority.*

24,2 *Refutation.* God is both wholly ingenerate and wholly uncreated, and so is the Son he has begotten, and so is his Holy Spirit < whom > you belittle, you carnal and natural Aetius who are spiritually discerned! (For the Holy Spirit has his distinctive character [from God] in a way peculiar to himself, and is not like the many things which have been created of him, through him, and because of him.)

24,3 And so [the Son] will have nothing in common with all things, nor can any creature share his rank. For all things are transitory and pass away; and he leaves every logical argument behind him, < defeated* > by the word of instruction from the sacred scripture, "No man knoweth the Son save the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him."[71] (4) But the Son reveals him through the Holy Spirit—not to those who argue about him, but to those who truly and fully believe in him. For even though you come with a million silly arguments, you pitiable object as I regard you, you can neither "find out his judgments" nor "search out his ways,"[72] as the scripture says.

25,1 8. *If the Ingenerate God is wholly generative, the Offspring was not generated as an essence, since God's essence is wholly generative and not generated. But if God's essence has been transformed and called an Offspring God's essence is not unalterable, since the transformation brought about the formation of the Son. But if God's essence is both unalterable and above generation, talk of "sonship" will admittedly be a mere verbal ascription.*

---

[71] Matt 11:27.
[72] Cf. Rom 11:33.

25,2 *Refutation.* Not only you, Aetius, but every "heretic" should "be avoided after one admonition,"[73] as the holy and wise commandment directs. For you stand "self-condemned,"[74] inviting your own destruction and not compelled to this by anyone else. (3) Who can pity one who is "evil to himself and good to no one?"[75] But for my part, lest you think in your self-< conceit >[76] that the evils you have propagated in the world are important objections [to the truth], I myself shall go patiently on grubbing up your thorny roots with "the two-edged sword, the word of Christ,"[77] by the sound, full and true confession of faith before God.

25,4 For glory to the merciful < God > who has found what sort you are—you who occupy the place of Judas, who was counted as one of the disciples but cut off from them, not by Christ's intent but because he had learned the denial of the Lord from Satan. (5) And what need is there to say anything more to you, since you are entirely different from Christians—from prophets, apostles, evangelists, martyrs and all the saints who are prepared to convict you at the day of judgment? For they endured the rack until death, they were scourged, torn, consigned to the beasts, fire, and death by the sword, rather than deny that he is God's Son and truly begotten of him.

25,6 For the Father is the Begetter of a sole Only-begotten, and of no one else after the One. And he is the Pourer forth of a Holy Spirit and of no other spirit. But he is the creator and the maker of all that he has made and continues to make. (7) Therefore, since many Sons are certainly not begotten and many Spirits do not proceed from him, and since the same Godhead remains forever and is glorified in a Trinity and is never augmented, diminished, or supposed not to exist, the rank is not limited to a mere name in the case of the Offspring. (8) [If it were], he would have many brothers like himself after him—as in the text, "I have begotten sons and exalted them,"[78] and, "who hath begotten the drops of dew,"[79] and, "of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named,"[80] and,

---

[73] Cf. Tit 3:10.
[74] Tit 3:11f.
[75] Cf. Ecclus 14:5.
[76] Holl ἐν σεαυτῷ <πεφυσιωμένος> omitting ἔχων. Otherwise, read ἐν σεαυτῷ ἐνδον also omitting ἔχων.
[77] Cf. Heb 4:12.
[78] Isa 1:2.
[79] Job 38:28.
[80] Eph 3:15.

"Have we not all one Father?"[81] and, "my son Jacob,"[82] and, "my firstborn Israel."[83] (9) These are all "sons" by a mere verbal locution, by analogy, because they have progressed from non-existence to existence, and are not [sons] essentially in the true sense of the word, but are merely < in locution > and by grace. Therefore they have been created by the One who is not called Son by grace or merely in name, but < is > truly the Son. [They are] created by the One, through the One, with him who proceeds from the One and receives of the Other.

26,1 9. *If the Offspring was in the Ingenerate God in germ, he was "brought to maturity," after his generation, as we might say, by receiving accretions from without. Therefore the Son is not "mature" because of the causes of his generation, but because of the accretions he received. For things which receive accretions genetically, in the sense of being constituted by them, are characteristically termed "mature" in a distinctive way.*

26,2 *Refutation.* If it had not been agreed that the Begetter is incorporeal, your entire performance might be worth staging. You scare no one else by staging it, however, but confuse your own mind [and deprive it] of the true confession of faith. (3) God, who is perfect in himself, begot of himself a perfect Son; he did not, contrary to nature, beget someone else. For the Son is not unsuited to his Begetter, and has no need to acquire anything from without. For, after the essence of God, there is nothing greater than God, which could share with God if he needed acquisition to come to maturity. (4) For He who is forever the incorporeal God has begotten the Incorporeal, by generation, to be with him forever; the Perfect has forever begotten the Perfect—God, who is spirit, begetting the subsistent Word, who is also spirit.

26,5 But what you say is silliness, Aetius, you treader on < the heights >, who get your ideas of God from syllogisms and out of your own logic-chopping head. For to the God who made all things from nothing and can do everything perfect at once, who needs no further benefaction and who governs these things by his decree, you are assigning the name of an essence that is subject to growth, and > a Word in need of extra divinity, and are not even putting him > on a level with his creatures. (6) For he made them perfectly at the beginning, and decreed by a wise ordinance that the things that would spring from them would have no need

[81] Mal 2:10.
[82] Isa 44:2; Jer 26:28.
[83] Exod 4:22.

to acquire anything. Those are the things in which successive generations have been and will be born—heaven, for example, the earth, water, air, the sun, the moon, the stars, and creatures which have been born from the waters—up to man himself. (7) God did not make heaven imperfect, or the earth in any way imperfect. He made the earth perfect and heaven perfect, though it was "invisible and chaos"[84] because of the order he was to impose on it. But he made water and the original light at the same time, making all things through the true Light, the uncreated and life-giving. (8) But then he made the things that have grown from the earth, and the firmament before that—not half-finished, but he made all things in their perfection. For < he says >, "Let the earth put forth herbage of pasture, sowing seed in its likeness upon the earth, and fruit-bearing trees whose seed is in them in their likeness upon the earth."[85]

26,9 And you see that the things God had made full grown needed no additional endowment at the moment of their creation; they were "adult," as it were, and perfect at once, by God's decree. (10) But the things which were bestowed on man to be his subjects and were with him in germ for him to rule, were not entrusted to him full grown. For man always knew the Benefactor who bestows being on all, but who is over all, and who provides each created thing's benefactions for the sustenance of those who are of service to him.

26,11 God gave man the earth with the potential for growth, laying it out before him like a floor, as it were, and entrusting it to him as a womb, so that man could borrow the seeds produced by the plants which God had made perfect, and which were sown in the earth with spontaneous wisdom as a tree can do, [and the seeds] of other produce—borrow them from the mature plants in bits as small as a pebble (12) and sow this produce, and await what would be given for their increase < by > the perfect God. The crops man sowed would thus be increased from without, and man would not be unaware of the Provider of the bounty, think himself the creator, and be deprived of the truth.

26,13 For even though Noah planted a vineyard, scripture does not call him planter; he "was made an husbandman."[86] There is a difference between God who bestows the original gifts on things that are to be, and man who has received being from God, to whom God's husbandry is

[84] Gen 1:2.
[85] Gen 1:11.
[86] Gen 9:20.

entrusted. The one is meant to tend the gifts needed for growth to maturity, but the other to provide the maturity, by his gift of his creatures and of things that grow to maturity. (14) And so with beasts and birds; so with domestic animals, reptiles and sea creatures. In the beginning they were all made full grown by the God who commanded it, but by the will of his wisdom they now need a gift [from him in order to grow]. This is intended for the mental benefit of man who rules on earth, so that < he > will recognize as God and Lord the God above all, the Provider of the seed-bearing plants and the gift of their growth.

26,15 For this reason God has left the heavenly bodies, which are not sown by human hands and which neither beget nor are begotten, in a full grown state. For they—the sun, moon and stars, for example—did not spur the human mind on to treachery and the pride of vainglory. (16) Not even the moon alters its appearance because it is born, wanes or waxes, but to mark and usher in the seasons, which God has regulated by the luminaries. (17) If God made corporeal things full grown at the outset when he chose, although they cause other things to decay, and they themselves decay, why should he beget the One he has begotten of himself—One [begotten] of one, the true God who is forever with the true God by generation—in need of any benefaction?

26,18 All right, Aetius, stop bringing me your worthless Aristotelian syllogisms! I have had enough of them and am not to be cheated of our Lord's true teaching, which says, "I came forth from the Father and am come."[87] The saying is not meant loosely, but gives indication of the essence of God's perfection and dignity.

27,1 10. *If the Offspring was full grown in the Ingenerate, it is an Offspring by virtue of properties which were in the Ingenerate, and not by virtue of those by which the Ingenerate generated it. [But this cannot be], for there can be no generacy in ingenerate essence; the same thing can< not > both be and not be. An offspring is not ingenerate, and if it were ingenerate it would not be an offspring, for to say that God is not homogeneous is to offer him sheer blasphemy and insult.*

27,2 *Refutation.* In his desire to understand God through logical terminology of human devising Aetius introduces opposition, and < falsely >[88] tries, with words, to mutilate the sure hope of the plain faith. He contrasts

[87] John 8:42.
[88] Holl ψεύδως, MSS καὶ ὡς.

unlike with unlike, and sets expression against expression to force them to mean the impossible, the unlikeness < of the Son > to the Father.

For he himself will be out-argued by the very arguments he has taught the world. (3) He says, "If the Offspring were full grown in the Ingenerate, it must be an Offspring by virtue of the properties within the Ingenerate, and not by virtue of those with which the Ingenerate generated it. [But this cannot be], for there can be no generacy in an ingenerate essence. The < same > thing can< not > both be and not be. An offspring is not ingenerate, and if it were ingenerate it could not be an offspring, for to say that God is not homogeneous is to offer him insult and blasphemy." This means that the ground gained by the words is exposed to attack on all sides, for the Son *cannot be* unlike the Father, or unequal to his perfect Godhead.

27,4 For if he will insist on saying this, but turns < the > words he uses against each other and keeps saying that "ingenerate" and "generate" are opposites, he should learn from this < to contrast > the created and the uncreated. For the one cannot share the rank of the other, which is fit< ness > for any sort of worship. (5) If a thing that is unlike [God] is fit for any worship, since it is the equal of something [else that is] unlike [God] there will no longer be any sense in distinguishing the one thing from all of them. The unlike < being > cannot be compared, in the position of its rank, with the One, even though this one thing out of all the unlike things has greater glory; the unlikeness of < all > of them to the One has nothing in common with the One. (6) And the end result will be that the sun, the moon, the stars, the earth, and further things inferior to these, will be objects of worship—but no longer the One, with the One Spirit, that is, one Trinity, one Godhead, one Worship.

27,7 And so, if we must draw this inference for this reason, it will truly be the correct one. For the one Word is not like all the words, nor is the one Son the same as everything that is called a son by analogy; for he is not one of them all, but the one through whom they all were made. (8) The thing which Aetius himself at the outset termed impossible, and an insult to God and sheer blasphemy—because, as he said, there is < no > non-homogeneity in God—is not part of the difference [between the Son and the Father], but part of [the Son's] equality with the Father. And since the Godhead is not divided but is eternal perfection there are three Perfects, one Godhead. (9) But, if anything, the doctrine of unlikeness was confirmed for us as a proof of the true faith, so that we will neither hold with, nor believe those who, by a rash preconception, have

been unworthily < carried away >[89] with the opinion of the pagans, who everyone knows worship the whole creation—which is unlike the Father who is worshiped in the Son, and the Son who is worshiped in the Father with the Holy Spirit, to whom be glory forever. Amen.

28,1 11. *If Almighty God, whose nature is ingenerate, knows that his nature is not generate, but the Son, whose nature is generate, knows that he is what he is, how can the homoousion not be a lie? For the one knows himself to be ingenerate, but the other, to be generate.*

28,2 *Refutation.* As a discriminator and surveyor who deals with the nature of God, Aetius, a human being who wants to know things that are beyond human nature, has said and declared that he knows—as a conclusion, not from scripture but from the arguments of the notions of mortals—that "Almighty God, who is of an ingenerate nature, knows that he is not of a generate nature." (3) But never yet, from the very beginning of his treatise, does he say even by implication that the Only-begotten is a Son, as the original Arians did. (4) From the impudent remarks he keeps making, sons of the truth, observe at every point that he would like the Son to be entirely different from the Father, and to have no part at all in the divine nature. For there is no point < in his saying > that < God > knows he is ingenerate, and that he knows that he is not of a generate nature, and it is said < merely > < so as not > to call the Son a Son, even in name.

28,5 But his argument will be demolished. The Father is ingenerate and, because his nature is appropriate to him, has generated the Only-begotten eternally, < and is a Father* > by his generation of the Only-begotten as his one and only [Son], and his issuance of the Spirit. [The Holy Spirit is] an only Spirit who < co-exists >, in addition to the Only-begotten, with the only Begetter; and who co-exists with the Son who is begotten without beginning. The Father is spirit and begets spirit; he is not a body which can be divided physically, and which decays, grows, and can be cut. (6) Therefore, in the cases of all other things that beget and are begotten, they may have need of each other for many reasons,[90] but here the rank of the One who is with the One, is not like all the others.

28,7 Therefore the Begotten himself, who has been uniquely begotten of him who has awesomely begotten him—just as he has been generated by the Ingenerate—is fit for his Begetter. He < therefore > begets no further sons himself—I mean, not of his essence—so that, because < the

[89] Holl Ἑλλήνων δόξαις ἀπαχθεῖσιν, MSS Ἑλληνων πταίειν.
[90] Holl ἀλλη <λων>, MSS ἀλλ᾽.

Son > begets no one else of his essence and the Father is not begotten, the full glory of their rank may be preserved in both ways, in the single unity of the rank of Godhead: a perfect Father, a perfect Son, and a perfect Holy Spirit. (8) And thus the sacred scripture knows that the homoousion is no lie, and neither is the pious reason that has devoutly learned to glorify and worship the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit by receiving the grace [for this] from God.

29,1 12. *If ingeneracy does not represent the reality of God but the incomparable name is of human invention, God owes the inventors thanks for their invention of the concept of ingeneracy, since in his essence he does not have the superiority the name implies.*

29,2 *Refutation.* I too, as I say to address Aetius, < confess the doctrine of > ingeneracy, and do not deny it even though it is not in sacred scripture; it is an orthodox idea. But in saying "ingenerate" I acknowledge that the Father is indeed ingenerate and do not deny that the Son is generate, although I do say that he is not created. Nor, if I declare that the Son is generate, can I deny that he has his being from God the Father. For the Father begot him by an act of generation, and did not create him.

29,3 For as you purposely pervert yourself—it can't be anything else—by thinking all crosswise about the "Generate and Ingenerate," you yourself must hear the words, "The thoughts of man are inclined to evil continually from his youth,"[91] with regard to human arguments, contradictory syllogisms and worthless human thought. (4) < But > I shall say for my part that, far sooner, it is inappropriate for the uncreated God to create creatures, and for the unmade God to make them. For if, as Aetius says, it is not proper that the ingenerate God beget, then it is inadmissible that the uncreated God create, and that the God who has not been made, make the things which are to be. (5) But since created things, and the greater part of their existing visible substance, are there to see, but do not befit the uncreated God < in the sense of > being his creatures, it will be desirable, in the end, that there be one uncreated God, and another who is created and, correspondingly, able to create. Otherwise the Incomparable will be cited for the change of created things, and, instead of what Aetius thinks of as suitable, will be regarded as unsuitable. (6) However, since the created God with the < power > to create is not self-generating but was created, another God will be required to be his creator, and another will therefore be invented. And there will be much idle talk about abysmal

[91] Gen 8:21.

error, for our intellects will no longer be sound, but will be instances of the saying, "The servants of God were made fools, and from knowledge, every man was made foolish."[92]

29,7 For no one "liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself."[93] Nor will one learn to know anything but God, who has revealed his true faith to us < and said >, "This is my beloved Son, hear ye him"[94]—and his Begotten, who has revealed his Father to us and said, "I came forth from the Father, and am come."[95] (8) And God did not get his incomparability from a human name, nor will the rank of the true, subsistent divine Word, begotten of the Father without beginning < and > co-essentially, be impaired because of God's incomparability. For neither of them is indebted to human inventions for the names. (9) The Godhead receives no new rank, and no addition. The Godhead itself, of its fullness, provides for all—a fullness ever the same and never lessened, but ever bearing in its own essence the rank of its name, power and essence.

30,1 13. *If ingeneracy is only something external observers observe to be God's, the observers are better than the One observed, for they have given him a name which is better than his nature.*

30,2 *Refutation.* True it is that no one is better than God—say I to Aetius, the inventor of all this. How can anyone be better than God, when all things have received their being from God? (3) But since God is the cause of his creatures, rational and non-rational, visible and invisible, he himself is better than all, even if his rational creatures are of a mind right as to orthodoxy, so as to give partial, [not full], honor to That which is better than they. (If everything put together, and innumerably more, which has been thought to apply to God's praise, could compass the fullness of his glory, the Better < Being > would always be beyond the conception of its inferiors—even if they reach out with all their might, and beyond their might, towards the ascription of praise to their Better. For he is "better," not [merely] in word, but in power, name and word.)

30,4 But the praise of the Better by the inferiors will not distinguish between Incomparable and Incomparable. It knows the superiority through ingeneracy that is inherent in the Father, and the superiority that has been begotten of him. (5) Therefore the right mind God has granted men confesses < the > homoousion. [It confesses this] to avoid inventing

---

92 Cf. Jer 28:17.
93 Rom 14:7.
94 Matt 17:5.
95 John 8:42.

the unlikeness of the Son to the Father, and so dividing the superior, pure Perfection of Him through whom it knows [the Son] to have been truly begotten in an incomparable manner by his Begetter who, because of his superiority, is beyond any conception.

31,1 14. *If ingeneracy is not susceptible of generation, this is what we maintain. But if it is susceptible of generation, the sufferings of generation must be superior to the real nature of God.*

31,2 *Refutation.* To speak of any sufferings in God at all is the height of impiety. The Godhead is entirely immune to suffering, and very far above anything that occurs in our conflicting notions, < and > Aetius' argument will be completely defeated. For whatever takes place in us accompanied by suffering, exists in God without suffering. (3) For in us, willing is partly suffering—I do not mean the will to be godly, but the will to do something beyond our nature, because we cannot do what our will would like—say a man's will to fly, soar in the air, view the veins of the abyss, know the depths of the earth, and things of this sort.

But whatever in me involves suffering, is in existence without suffering in God. (4) For this reason God can do all he wills; for his nature does not conflict with his will, while our nature conflicts with as many desires as we have to reach out towards the impossible.

31,5 And because I have said that God does what he will, let no one by any means say that he does the unsuitable. Not at all! God wills those things that he does, proportionately to his rank, with his will not in conflict with his capability, or his capability contrary to his will. But < God does not do the unsuitable* >, not because he cannot, but because he will not.

31,6 And otherwise. But come to think of it, after this freedom from suffering that exists in God, and after < the nature > in us and in other creatures that is subject to suffering, we must admit that there is, in fact, still another "suffering"; and after the second kind, a third kind can also be distinguished. (7) We beget and are begotten with suffering, since our nature, and that of the other creatures which are begotten and beget, can be divided and drained, can expand and contract, can be burdened and lightened, and all the other things which are subject to suffering for such a reason.

But none of these were in God in his begetting of the Son. (8) If there were one such thing in God—in accordance with < the > doctrine which serves < them > as an excuse for repudiating the "Offspring"—I must reply to them, as the representative of the other side, that there is a second suffering, suffering in creating, and that we suffer in begetting and being begotten. (9) God, however, whom you conceive of as a creator and not

a begetter and whom, as an argument against us, you accuse of suffering in begetting, in order to deny the legitimacy of the Son but consign suffering in creation to oblivion—(but this is not a form of suffering in God, heaven forbid! < God is entirely impassible* >. (10) We neither attribute suffering to God by the confession that he is the creator of all, nor, again, do we conceive of < another kind of > suffering in connection with him by confessing that he has begotten the true Son, truly without beginning and not in time.)

We therefore know that his nature is incomprehensible and not subject to suffering. (11) Hence we confess him both as impassible begetter and as impassible creator. For he begot the Only-begotten without suffering, sent the Holy Spirit forth from himself without being divided, and created what has been and is being created without being afflicted by ills or suffering. And he does what he will, in keeping with his Godhead, without reflecting first in order to determine by consideration whether the thing to be done ought to be done or willing to do a thing and, because of suffering, lacking the power to gratify will with performance. (12) He possesses at once will, deed, the begetting of the Only-begotten, and the creation of all things, for the divine nature and rank is far beyond the conception of Aetius' logic, and the logic of all humanity. God is superior to all invention, and gives way to no suffering but is far beyond all sufferings and any conception.

32,1 15. *If the Offspring is unchangeable by nature because of its Begetter, then the Ingenerate is an unchangeable essence, not because of his will, but because of its essential rank.*

32,2 *Refutation.* How long has this man been coming to me with the same thing to say, and never going beyond its content? From beginning to end he has described exactly the same things, and nothing else, about the same things. He has revealed no mysteries to me, (3) and has not taught me God as he professes to; nor faith, working with which the apostles, with a sound confession of the truth, raised the dead, cleansed lepers and < performed > all the other acts of good concord, by which they gave examples of the real working [of miracles]. Instead he expounds useless, boastful syllogisms which do not go beyond their repetition, but are just that and nothing else. Please, then, none of you readers blame me if I attack the same points myself, since I am obliged to reply to his repetition.

32,4 For the Offspring is unchangeable as it befits Godhead to be, and the Begetter is unchangeable as, correspondingly, it befits his unchangeable nature that he be. The Begetter continues forever to have the Son he has begotten, and allows his creatures no expectation of knowing the Father without the Son, and of ever knowing the Begotten without the

Father, and his perfect Spirit who proceeds from the Father and receives of the Son. (5) And this befits the rank of God's essence—not to need any additional rank but to have it eternally in its proper identity.

33,1 16. *If "ingeneracy" is indicative of essence, it may properly be contrasted with the essence of the Offspring. But if "ingeneracy" means nothing, all the more must "Offspring" mean nothing.*

But how < could > nothing be contrasted with nothing? If the expression, "ingenerate," is contrasted with the expression, "generate" but silence succeeds the expression, the hope of Christians may well begin and end [there] since it rests in a particular expression, not in natures which are such as the meaning of their names implies.

33,2 *Refutation.* After learning to stupefy the minds of the simple, why do these people love to anticipate the points against themselves! Aetius, who has his hope merely in an expression and not in truth, has impudently come forward to pin it on me, although it does not embarrass him to confess that the Son of God and God the Father < differ > in a mere word. And yet I, of all people, confess that the Father is real, the Son is real, and the Holy Spirit is real; for nothing else can be compared with the Trinity.

33,3 And therefore the homoousion is truly the stay of my confession, and not as an expression that can be canceled by use and disuse, like Aetius' opinion of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. (4) There is actually a true Father, and actually a true Son and Holy Spirit, however many worthless syllogisms Aetius sows broadcast. As the sacred scripture says of such people, "I will destroy the wisdom of the wise,"[96] and, 'The Lord knoweth the thoughts of man, that they are vain,"[97] and so on.

34,1 17. *If the term, "ingenerate," as against the term, "offspring" contributes nothing toward superiority of essence, the Son, who is [therefore] surpassed only verbally, will know that those who have termed him "Son" are his betters, not He who is termed his "God and Father."*

34,2 *Refutation,* No matter how much play-acting Aetius does for me, no pious reason can allow that those who have received being from Him Who Is are better < than the Son >. For he himself agrees that they have been made through him. (3) For those who have been vouchsafed his kindness, < and > are privileged to be called Christians because they truly know him and have been taught, not by flesh and blood but by the Father,

[96] 1 Cor 1:19.
[97] Ps 93:11.

and who are therefore rightly called blessed—like him (i.e., Peter) who recognized the Son of God, with the addition of "living"[98] [to "God"]—have not learned to call him "Offspring," as a verbal expression, but as a "true Son begotten of a true Father." Nor are they spiritually discerned, < as > He who is spirit and only-begotten < discerns > the soulish Aetius as incapable of receiving the things of the Spirit.

34,4 < For* > even though he says, "I go unto my Father and your Father, unto my God and your God,"[99] < the Son remains above the beings which have been created through him* >. (5) Neither of these names can be equated with names of other sorts; the truth abides forever, and each order which is needed in the Son of God truly teaches it clearly. (6) For "my Father and your Father" cannot apply to them in the fleshly sense; how can God, who did not assume flesh, be the Father of flesh? And "my God and your God" cannot apply to the Son's divine nature and the disciples' adoption as sons. (7) With < the words >, "my God and your God," he who tells the truth in all things for our < salvation > was mysteriously assuring the disciples of his human nature. When he said, "my God and your God," he < meant God's natural > relationship to him by the "my"—and at the same time his relationship to us "which, in my kindness," < he says >, "I allowed you to make your own by my coming," as the scripture says, "He gave them power to become sons of God."[100]

34,8 Thus he himself took the form of a servant when he came among them, and partook of something recent in latter days (i.e., Christ's human nature), though what was ancient (i.e., Christ's divine nature) remained as it was and did not change in order to be mixed [with anything new]. The sons of men were changed to incorruption by participation in God, but not united with him in co-essentiality; and he who took the form of a servant indicated his recency by the word, "took," but did not undergo a change, as is shown by "being in the form of God."[101] (9) Since these things are so, and are wisely confessed, with full knowledge, by those whom God has taught, neither "my God and your God" nor "my Father and your Father" will express any difference from the rightful common possession of the pure divine essence, < or > from the transcendence of the Father's union with the Son, and the Son's, and likewise the Holy Spirit's, with the Father.

---

98 Cf. Matt 16:17.
99 John 20:31.
100 John 1:12.
101 Phil 2:6–7.

35,1 18. *If the ingenerate essence is superior, and innately superior, it is ingenerate essence per se. For it is not superior to generation deliberately because it so wills, but because this is its nature. Since ingenerate nature per se is God, it allows no reasoning to think of generation in connection with it, and resists all examination and reasoning on the part of generate beings.*

35,2 *Refutation.* Aetius has involved me with the same bothers and, as I said, got me to repeat myself even frequently, because of his repetition, from beginning to end, of the same remarks about the same things. (3) The faith which saves every faithful person has never consisted of the speculation of human reasoning; human ideas are fallible, and cannot attain to the boundlessness of the essence of God. (4) Indeed, the whole of our salvation, the life-giving mystery of Christ, is "to the Jews a stumbling block, to Greeks foolishness. But to us who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God. For the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men."[102]

35,5 Well then, wouldn't one class Aetius with the Jews because of the stumbling block of his syllogisms, but < regard > him as Greek because, in his own would-be wisdom, he considers God's truth foolishness? (6) For though the creator and artificer of all < is > one and is greater than all creation and handiwork, this does not mean that, because he is greater than his creatures, he does not make and create his creatures; he is not envious of his own goodness. For he is possessed of absolute goodness in his own right, and this is greater than all. He is not the victim of emotions, and it was not from envy or jealousy that he made what is out of what is not.

35,7 For he did not intend the things which he made, but which are inferior to his incomparable Godhead, to his own disadvantage, < making* > his creatures < to his own harm* >. He made them for his glory to manifest his own generous Godhead, for he is absolute goodness and self-existence[103] and imparts being to all the beings he has created from non-being because he wills them—each creature in proportion—to share the gift of each thing. (8) To the luminaries he has granted light, to the sky the beauties of orderly arrangement, and portions of excellence to the earth and the rest, in accordance with his will. And on the angels themselves, and on other holy hosts, he has bestowed the gift of immortality; and on man he has bestowed the dignity of his image, and the gracious gift of life, knowledge

[102] 1 Cor 1:23–25.

[103] This, and the other nouns beginning with αὐτό, suggest that Epiphanius read αὐτοουσία at 35,1.

and rationality. (9) And it was not only after hesitation, as one might say, that this came to him, by consent, or after a wait or a change of mind or on reflection, but of his absolute goodness. For his nature, in his absolute goodness, is to have, to make, and to complete all things in a way that is becoming to himself.

35,10 Thus, as God procured nothing unbecoming his goodness < in > this, but glory and the knowledge of an awesome bounty, so there is no additional glory for his Godhead when he becomes known and perceived by his creatures. (11) The Godhead is never in need of an addition of glory. < It is > absolute glory, absolute excellence, absolute wonder and absolute praise, because the Father begot a Son though he himself was not begotten, < and the Son was begotten > to be with the Father as an eternal Wellspring of an everlasting Wellspring—stemming from him as Wellspring of Wellspring, God of God and light of light, with no beginning, not in time, but truly having a Father, while at the same time the Father truly has a Son not unbecoming to his Father, and without prejudice to the Father's incomparability. (12) For he is not a physical contraction but a subsistent Word, a Son of a Father, spirit of spirit and God of God. He excludes every speculation of logic, but is for the salvation of the faithful and of all that are made, through him and by him, by the Father, and who believe and know, and do not regard the power of God as foolishness—and do not regard the wisdom of God as foolishness, since it transcends all examination and all reasoning, particularly mortal men's, as Aetius himself has unwillingly admitted.

36,1 19. *If "ingenerate," when applied to God, connotes privation but "ingenerate" must be nothing, what reasoning can take away nothing from a non-existent thing? But if it means something that is, who can separate God from being, that is, separate him from himself?*

36,2 *Refutation.* Aetius tells me the things the pagan controversialists say about "privation" as though he were discussing this with reference to the knowledge of God and < for a profitable purpose >, but without knowing, to start with, the cases in which "privation" is understood by the pagans. (3) Dialectic does not agree that "privation" can be spoken of with regard to everything, but only with regard to those things which possess something by nature. For, [Aetius to the] contrary, one speaks of "privation" < in the cases of > things which admit of the cessation the things they have by nature; one does not say it of things which do not.

36,4 Thus one cannot say "blind" of a stone. A person who is sighted by nature and then loses his sight, is called blind. But surely if a bird, a

man, or < any > beast whose nature is to see—when it is deprived of sight, it is called "blind" in the sense of a privation. (5) Similarly we cannot say "even-tempered" of < a stone >, or "harmless" or "ungrudging;" this is not a stone's nature. But of a man, or a beast with an irritable nature, one would speak of privation when it is not angry—but never in the case of things which cannot be angry.

36,6 I must apply this to God too, as though I were directing the argument at Aetius and cross-examining him. "Tell me, Aetius, do you know that God cannot be compared with all the things that are not of the same essence as his? Or would you even dare to count him as one of them all? (7) And if you would count him < with > all the things that are not of his essence, but which he has made from nothing through the Son who is begotten of his essence—[with all things, that is], with the sole exception of him (i.e., the Son) and the Holy Spirit, who is of the essence of the incomparable Father and his only-begotten Son—[if that is what you think of him], your confession of faith must be absurd in the extreme. (8) How can He by whom all things have been made from nothing, still be one of all things? This is impossible, and not even you would say it.

"But since he cannot possibly be like, or the same as, the beings which were made by him from nothing, he cannot possibly suffer like the beings which are unlike him—for whose emergence from non-being he is responsible, and all of whose qualities result from the privation of their opposites. (9) For some of them are sighted, not of themselves—(for they do not have being of themselves, but by the generous grace of its Giver)—and suffering may < be caused > in these by the privation of things which they had by the gift of the Giver. He, [meanwhile], is impassible and has his being from no one, and cannot be deprived, < like > the creatures which are made from nothing.

36,10 "Thus, if neither the Son, the Father nor the Holy Spirit is the same as they, but the Son is different from them and is not called by the same name, but has a special, incomparable name because < he is > absolute good and the Son of Absolute Good—[if all this is so], what can he have to do with privation < when* > there are < no* > opposites in < his nature* >?" (11) There is no need for Aetius' argument to tell me about privation, for it is not by the privation which is characteristic of creatures that the ingenerate God and his generate Son have their superior rank, but because of its natural and special appropriateness in itself to their being and Godhead.

So with God's freedom from anger. This is not because he is < not > angry, but because he is absolute freedom from anger. And the reason he

is "ingenerate" is his absolute < in >generacy, even if the Son is generated from the Ingenerate. For talk of privation in the sense intended by the person suggesting [it] has no relevance to Him who is not comparable to the other beings. (12) For neither can the others be equated with the Generate, nor does the Ingenerate impart co-essentiality [with himself] to creatures. This is not because impossibility is an attribute of the Mighty [God], but because, due to the unique nature of the one God, and his only-begotten Son with the Holy Spirit, impossibilities do not apply to the Mighty [God].

37,1 20. *If the "privations" of states are the removals of them, "ingenerate" as applied to God is either the privation of a state, or a state of privation. But if "ingenerate" is the privation of a state, how can something God does not have be counted as one of his attributes'? If "ingenerate" is a state, however, a generate essence must be assumed to precede it, so that it may acquire [a new] state and be called "ingenerate." If, however, the generate essence partook of an ingenerate essence [to begin with], it has been deprived of its generation by sustaining the loss of a state.*

Generacy must then be an essence but ingeneracy a state. But if "offspring" implies a coming to be it is plain that the word means a state, whether the Offspring is made out of some essence, or whether it is what it is called, an "Offspring."

37,2 *Refutation.* By already fighting fiercely, on the subject of privation, on the side of those who are strange to the faith, Aetius too has armed himself against the faith with the same weapons as they. But he says nothing that is based on the faith, and has not remembered what was said to those who say foolish things of their own invention and do not hold the Head of the faith—as the word says in refutation of them, "I said in my astonishment, All men are liars,"[104] after "I am deeply humbled."[105]

37,3 Now, however, he again spends his time on the same things, and cites the rubbish of the terms, "privation" and "state," and the reasonings of shaky human speculation. And though he is spiritually discerned he takes no trouble to restrain the special onslaught of an < idea which stems > from human villainy, because of which he < undertakes > to say what he pleases about God. (4) Moreover, he once more obliges me to dwell on the same things myself although I have discussed the topic of

104 Ps 115:2.
105 Ps 115:1.

privation at length, and to spend my time in refutations of him. And the previous refutation should be enough since, being equally weighty and the same as his syllogistic argument, it can used against each one.

37,5 But we must not leave a hard-mouthed horse unbridled, whether it is galloping toward a ditch or has already been checked in its career. Nor may we give way to a man who is saying the same things against the faith, and not reply to him. So I shall speak again < to the question of > (6) "If the privations of states are the removals of them, 'ingeneracy,' as applied to God is either the privation of a state or a state of privation" and, "If it is the privation of a state, how can something God does not have be counted as one of his attributes?"

37,7 And if < you pretend > to think of God in this way or that way, Aetius, and guess at "states" with regard to God, you will be deprived of your mind. No matter how many ideas about God enter your head to be stored away there—except just to believe him, marvel at him, and glorify him with all your heart!—you will be exposed as unable to out-argue God, his Son or his Holy Spirit, so that God will convict you, and you will be made a liar, as the scripture says. (8) There are states, wants and shaky ideas in us, since that is our nature and essence. But we can also speak of the nature and essence of God; and because we hear of God's nature and ours, and God's essence and ours, this does not mean that we are to compare the incomparable God with our nature. (9) And so with all that you say about God, Aetius. The Godhead is *per se* transcendent, incomparable, perfect in itself, with no need of anything; for it is absolute perception and absolute will.

37,10 Thus God has not been deprived of his < own > essence by incomparably begetting an incomparable only-begotten Son, nor < has he deprived the Offspring >, whom he has begotten of him as the only Offspring of an only Father, of his rank—nor the Holy Spirit. For the Offspring has no equality of nature, rank, or anything else with other beings. (11) God has not deprived himself of his incomparable Godhead in state or essence. Nor, as I said, has his Offspring been deprived of his Father's rank and his equality with the Father, (12) since it, like his Holy Spirit, cannot be compared with anything at all.

In fact, it is a perfect Trinity: the Father perfect, the Son perfect, the Holy Spirit perfect. It is not an identity and does not differ from itself or have any subordination. (13) Otherwise what had been distinguished would remove the Offspring's incomparability, and what had been altered would cause a deprivation of [its] being, for it would either be called [an Offspring] in appearance and not in truth, or else it would be named by

a mere word in passing, and not really exist. At any rate, this is the way your idea is meant, Aetius, for it tries to exclude him from the definition of faith, (14) "He that cometh unto God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek him."[106] And this cannot apply to the Father alone, "for he that hath not the Son hath not the Father;"[107] and if one speaks of the Son, he cannot do so "without the Holy Spirit."[108]

37,15 For the Father is truly "true God,"[109] as the Son, who knows the Father, testifies. And the Son, who is known and witnessed to by the Father, is "true light."[110] And the Spirit, who is not different [from God] but proceeds from the Father and receives of the Son, is the "Spirit of truth."[111] (16) But these truths put an end to all the syllogistic story-telling of your words, Aetius, and I cannot be told to become a disciple of your master Aristotle, and abandon < the teaching > of the fishermen who, though "< un >learned and ignorant men,"[112] were enlightened in the Spirit of God, and by God's power were heralds of the truth as it was vouchsafed them. For the kingdom of heaven is not in syllogistic speech and boastful talk, but in power and truth. (17) Indeed I have heard enough, from the beginning, of your argument about the privation of states and accidents, and that generate essence does and doesn't assume ingeneracy, and that it sustains the loss of a state with a state, and the involvement of generate essence with a state which is, however, ingenerate; and the passing mention of an "offspring," though this means "only in the state [of being an offspring]" and, because it has been remodeled from some essence or other, indicate< s > a state, even though, as you have said, it is called an offspring. (18) For your sick fancy says < the > same things on the same subjects, and never utters the last of its repetitions.

38,1 21. *If "ingeneracy" is a state and "generacy" is a state, the essences are prior to the states; but even though the states are secondary to the essences, they are more important.*

Now if ingeneracy is the cause of generacy and means that there is an offspring which implies the cause of its own being, "offspring" denotes an essence, not a state. < On the other hand >, since ingeneracy implies nothing besides itself, how can the ingenerate nature be not an essence, but a state?

---

106 Heb 11:6.
107 John 2:23 (5:12).
108 1 Cor 12:3.
109 John 17:3.
110 1 John 2:8.
111 John 16:13.
112 Acts 4:13.

38,2 *Refutation.* As you see, friends of the truth, Aetius is once more attempting to form an argument that distinguishes states in God, and states after God. And he puts some of them first, and others second. (3) But it is not right to assume firsts of God, or speak of seconds. God has all things at once and needs no additions. This is why pious reason does not allow the Offspring to be conceived of as born at some time. (4) < Nothing new* > co-exists with God the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit—that is, with the Trinity that *Is.* And so the God Who Is, is called the Father Who Is, and the Son Who Is is with Him Who Is, begotten without beginning and not in time. As the scripture says, "With thee *is* the well of life," and, "in thy light shall we see light";[113] and "he who *is* in the bosom of the Father";[114] and "In the beginning *was* the Word, and the Word was God."[115] And it says likewise of the Holy Spirit, "My Spirit *is* in the midst of you."[116] (5) And you see that there is nothing new in the Trinity. Therefore there is neither essence before state, nor state before essence.

38,6 And even if you make us say "state" of God, Aetius, we do not mean the precarious states, subject to change, which are in all the things that have non-essential states; and we do not mean anything in God that is more honorable [than He], or of later origin [than He]. We mean everything that, for his glory, is suitable to his rank; one glory and one honor to the one Godhead, "that they may honor the Son as they honor the Father,"[117] (7) and not blaspheme the Holy Spirit—because of the threat that does not forgive their sin either here or in the world to come. Nothing different [from this] can fitly be understood, worshiped or glorified in connection with the Trinity. We speak of, and truly glorify a Father in the Father, a Son in the Son, and a < Holy Spirit > in the Holy Spirit, just as the true faith fitly < requires > that we accord worshipful reverence to the one Trinity, and know its rank. (8) And the Ingenerate does not need the Generate to contribute to its essence, making the Generate the cause of its essence < because > Generate denotes < an essence >. And the essence of the Begotten neither is, nor is called, a state of the Unbegotten.

38,9 For the Trinity is in need of nothing and receives no increment. Though the Trinity was always itself and no creature, this does not mean that it was by random chance, or for the honor of an additional title or an increase in dignity, that the Father thought of creating heaven, earth

[113] Ps 35:10.
[114] John 1:18.
[115] John 1:1.
[116] Hag 2:15.
[117] John 5:23.

and all things visible and invisible through the Son, and stablishing the whole host of those very creatures of his by his Spirit—to gain the additional tribute of being called Creator and Artificer from the creation of the creatures and the making of creation, < and > of being perceived as Father besides, by the Son through whom and by whom the creatures had been made, and by the Holy Spirit in whom what was stablished had been stablished. (10) For God did not make his handiwork because he was changed from state to state and altered in his nature and essence, < or > as though by reflection and a changeable < mind >. He had eternal creativity and perfection in himself and needs no increment of glory. (11) And as no creature may conceive of an additional state in God and suppose that this is required by God's dignity, essence and glory, so Aetius, who wants to out-argue God about "ingenerate," "generate," and his argument about God's state and essence, will be stopped short. For it is agreed that all created things genuinely exist, and have not been contrived as an addition of glory to a God who needs none—just as we may not say that the Only-begotten and his Holy Spirit are the same as God's creatures, for this is not acceptable.

38,12 But since Aetius, with his chatter about high things and his impudent reaching towards the heavens, has come to me with syllogisms but draws his analogies from the creatures below, it will be found that he himself < has accomplished* > nothing < worthwhile* > with his logical arguments. For the wisdom of men passes away, and men's syllogisms are buried [with them]; "His spirit shall come forth and turn him to his dust."[118] (13) For all human argumentations are transitory and humankind will pass away, together with the artful reasoning about the faith of Aetius < and persons like himself >. But as the scripture says, the faith, hope and the love which he has despised[119] abide.

39,1 22. *If every essence is ingenerate like Almighty God's, how can one say that one essence is subject to vicissitudes while another is not? But if the one essence remains above quantity and quality and, in a word, all sorts of change because of its classification as ingenerate, while the other is subject to vicissitudes < and yet > is admitted to have something unchangeable in its essence, we ought to attribute the characteristics of these essences to chance,*

[118] Ps 103:2.

[119] Holl and MSS ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ συλλογιστίκη πίστις. We conjecture ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ καταπεφρονημένη.

or, as is at any rate logical, call the active essence ingenerate but the essence which is changed, generate.

39,2 *Refutation.* I deny that every being is unbegotten,[120] or that every being is begotten of God. The God who has begotten the Son who has been begotten of him, and who has sent his Holy Spirit forth from himself, did not beget all beings. He begot One, who is therefore only-begotten; and he sent one Spirit forth from himself, who is therefore a *Holy* Spirit. But he created all beings through the One, and stablished them in the One, and some of them beget after their creation and are begotten, while some have been created, but neither beget nor are begotten.

39,3 But the uncreated being of the Trinity is far different from the beings that have been created, and not begotten, by the Trinity. (4) And so the Trinity is impassible and changeless, but all things after the Trinity < are > subject to suffering—unless the Impassible should grant impassibility by virtue of immortality, granting this as a generous gift to whom it will. They, however, do not have impassibility by virtue of an incorporeal nature, but by the generosity of the good and impassible God.

39,5 For not even the Only-begotten procures suffering in the flesh for his Godhead—although it is believed, by a true confession that stems from the true faith, that he suffered in the flesh although he was the impassible divine Word. But in his impassibility he remained the same, with no change or alteration of nature. (6) Therefore, since he was wisdom and impassible God, and knew that by suffering he would save those who are subject to the pain of death, he did not send "a messenger or an angel,"[121] or < anyone > further like the prophets before him, but came himself as Lord, assumed passibility and truly suffered, though his divine nature remained impassible.

39,7 For the incarnation did not weaken the power of his Godhead. We find him in his Godhead doing the works of God, and not prevented by flesh. He rebukes the wind, storm and sea, calls Lazarus by his sovereign authority, and does innumerable other things and more. (8) But he also allowed the flesh such things as were suitable—allowed the devil to tempt him, for example, men to strike him, the authorities to arrest him—so that the Impassible would suffer in his passible nature, but remain impassible in his proper Godhead. (9) For he is not different from the impassible God, but does all things willingly in accordance with his

[120] The context shows that Epiphanius understands ἀγέννητον here.
[121] Cf. Isa 63:9.

awesome mystery—just as the Father contains all things, who is God with the Only-begotten himself and his Holy Spirit, one forever perfect Trinity and one impassible Godhead. He is one God and one sovereignty, for the same God contains all.

39,10 And his containing of all things does not make him passible, although the things he contains are subject to suffering. For God is within all and without all, not mingled with any. (11) And though God is everywhere, is without all things and contains all things, and all things are moved within him, they will not bring suffering on the impassible God—just as, < though > he has begotten the Only-begotten, or < because > the Only-begotten has been begotten, or though God's Holy Spirit has been sent forth, this will not bring suffering on the Holy Trinity. (12) For neither is the Holy Spirit passible, even though he descended to the Jordan in the form of a dove. Nor is the Only-begotten passible, even though he was baptized and touched by John; nor the Father, even though he cried from heaven in a voice audible to men, "This is my beloved Son; hear ye him."[122] (13) The Son, then, is immutable. And the Father is unbegotten, while the Son is begotten < but > impassible. And the Holy Spirit, who came forth, is also < impassible >. But all other things are creatures. The Holy Trinity, < however >, retains its quantity and uncreated name, with no change in the Supreme Being and no liability to suffering on the part of the Begotten, for neither does the Begetter suffer.

For the Offspring is not corporeal, but spirit [begotten] of spirit and Son of Father. (14) And the Spirit is likewise "of him," Spirit of the Father, Spirit of Christ, not created, not begotten, not their kinsman, not their ancestor, not their scion. For the incomparable being of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit surpasses all conception and all understanding, to speak not only of men, but of angels. (15) Neither the Only-begotten, nor his Father, nor his Holy Spirit underwent any change because the Only-begotten suffered in the flesh despite his impassibility, his Holy Spirit < descended > in the form of a dove, and the Father impassibly uttered a cry from heaven in the hearing of men. (16) Just so the angels when they were created, and the heavens, the earth and all things, underwent no change and suffering at the hands of their maker. The whole is an awesome mystery as the scripture says, "O the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God!"[123]

---

[122] Matt 3:17; 17:5.
[123] Rom 11:33.

40,1 23. *If the ingenerate nature is the cause of the nature that has come to be, and yet "ingenerate" is nothing, how can nothing be the cause of a thing that has come to be'?*

40,2 *Refutation.* The ingenerate nature has a < causal > relationship in a different sense—not in the sense in which it is causally related to all things—to its only-begotten Offspring and the Holy Spirit who proceeds from it. But it is not causally related to them in the way in which that which exists is causally related to that which does not. For the Begotten is not begotten of nothing, and neither the Begetter nor the Holy Spirit who proceeds from him are non-existents—on the contrary, the Existent is the cause of the rest. (3) Therefore the holy Trinity co-exists in its own eternal glory, forever in an existence proportionate to each name for its rank. For the things which have been made from nothing, have been made by the Trinity, and not by anything external to it.

Therefore not even the Father is the cause of created things by himself, but the Father, Son and Holy Spirit made all things. (4) If the Son were different [from the Father], as though he < had been made > from nothing by a cause, he would have come forth along with everything else, and would himself have been the same < as they >. And God would have not been the cause by generation of the Son who had been brought forth, but would have been his cause by creation. And it could not be admissible that the one be called an offspring and the others creatures, but all should be called offspring along with him, or he should be called a creature like all the rest. And nothing would be exceptional (5) since, in that they were created from nothing, the One would be equivalent to all. I should say that not just angels would be equal to their maker and only-begotten creator, but men and cattle, and everything else that is infinitely inferior to his nature and rank.

40,6 < However >, He Who Is < forever > co-exists with Him Who Is Truly Begotten of him, though not in time—not [made] from nothing, but [begotten] of him. (7) And his Holy Spirit, which is in being, does not differ from his essence, and is not provided to God as though for his assistance, which is what Aetius says.

41,1 24. *If "ingenerate" is a privation but a privation is the loss of a state, and if a "loss" is completely destroyed or changed to something else, how can the essence of God be named after a changing or vanishing state by the title of "ingenerate?"*

41,2 *Refutation.* If the opinion of God which is to be derived from your syllogisms has been provided for God's glory only in your time—as your words above suggest—I too shall direct the same sort of remarks

to you with God's permission, and address you myself. For since none of the ancient apostles or prophets in the Old and New Testaments held this opinion, you are asserting your superiority to God himself, and your unshakeability. (3) According to what you say, only in your time did the Godhead acquire this syllogistic subtlety of yours for its creed—this speaking about the privation of the ingenerate and generate, about the complete loss of a state and its change, and the naming of God with a word for the divine essence.

41,4 Since God is the creator of all things after his Only-begotten and Holy Spirit, there cannot be any privation of things which are not his attributes. Nor has the affirmation of attributes been acquired, so that his later creations add something better to God, and his purity can be conceived of through its ability to be deprived of that in favor of this as well as through its changelessness. (5) The Godhead, however, is forever the same, and though it is wholly glory, and wholly incomprehensible by all its creatures, it is glorified by all, in accordance with the capacity of those who exert themselves in its praise. By the angels it is glorified in the tongue of angels, which the apostle declares to be preferable to men's. < But by men > it is glorified in the tongue of men, which is of an inferior capacity; < by the other creatures* >, in accordance with their still more inferior ability. (6) And God's glory has by no means been lessened or changed because God < is glorified > in each creature proportionately to < its ability >. It is unchangeable in itself, while all creation, in addition to its endless exertion of itself in praise, suffers deprivation; but the Supreme Being forever surpasses all understanding, and is neither changed, altered nor improved by the things everyone says are permitted to it. For the same Godhead is superior, incomparable and glorified.

42,4 If you worship the Father only in name, you have given him the honor deceitfully. And if you worship the Son while recognizing that he is unlike the Father, you have introduced confusion into the worship by honoring unlike equally with unlike. (5) If, however, you deny the Son worship from the prejudice of your unbelief, you will be reproved by all for failing to recognize Him who is rightly worshiped by all, and who is equal [to the Father]. "For all the angels of God shall worship him,"[124] and Mary and all his disciples worshiped him when he had risen gloriously in the flesh. (6) For they knew that he does not have the title of "born" or "created" < but > is begotten of the Father; and they worship him as the

[124] Heb. 1:6 (Ps. 96:7).

real God [begotten of] the real God, and worship the Holy Spirit, who is of him.

42,7 For they know that he differs in essence from creatures; he is not born or created, but begotten of the Father. And so, Aetius, after laboring over everything, spending a great deal of time, and introducing strange terms, < in the end you too* > will worship him.[125] (8) "For we must all stand before the judgment seat,"[126] and "every tongue will confess that Jesus Christ is Lord"—Jesus Christ, who is not different from God but "to the glory of God the Father,"[127] as scripture says and as we believe.

43,1 26. *If, as applied to God, "ingenerate" is a mere name, but the mere expression elevates the being of God over against all generate things, then the human expression is worth more than the being of the Almighty, since it is has embellished God the Almighty with incomparable superiority.*

43,2 *Refutation.* "Ingeneracy" is not a mere name when applied to God, and does not have any relationship of essence with created things. Thus "created things" is not a mere name either. But since another name in between "ingenerate" and "created" is needed, and this name is "Son"—< generate > and yet not created—which name shall we make the exception (i.e., exceptional in being a "mere" name, though the other two names represent reality)?

43,3 And if we grant that, [as Aetius says], created things are related [to the Son], then, since neither of the things we are mentioning (i.e., "creatures" and "Son") is spoken of with a mere name, (4) mere naming is not allowable in the case of the Generate and Son, just as mere naming is not allowable in the case of the Ingenerate and Creator, and in the case of created things. Aetius' senseless quibble will therefore show confusion in his reasoning, since, because created < nature > exists in reality and not < by > the mere naming of it, created beings cannot be equated with the name of "Son." For the Son himself does not permit the naming of "Son" to be the naming of a mere name.

43,5 But since the non-existent is not real, and the Son is not called "only-begotten" as a mere name, he is united with the Father's glory and is not to be mixed in with the category of creatures. (6) For the Godhead has no need of elevation, as though it did not exist. Nor does it need exaltation, even though, by some ignorant people, it is not exalted. And

---

[125] Holl <τέλος καὶ σὺ> προσκυνήσει αὐτῷ, Drexl, with MSS . . . καί λόγους ξενοὺς παρενηνέγκας αὐτῷ.

[126] 2 Cor 5:10.

[127] Phil 2:11.

the being of the Godhead is not constituted by anyone's verbal locution. (7) No expression, of men or other creatures, can boast of winning glory as though for a God who needs it, or of embellishing God almighty, the God whom we worship, the God who is the master, creator and artificer of the expression. (8) For it does not suppose that it surpasses him in glory and is the beautifier of its own creator. Otherwise it would regard itself as worshipful, and certainly not worship Him who is to be worshiped. And your treatise, Aetius, starts a useless argument against all this to no purpose.

44,1 27. *If there is a cause to correspond with everything generate but the ingenerate nature has no cause, "ingenerate" does not denote a cause but means an entity.*

44,2 *Refutation.* Everything generate indeed has a cause, and I do not admit this as though I have learned it from you. The faith of the truth foresees, confesses at the outset, and teaches that God has no cause at all, and that he is uncompounded and entirely unequaled.

44,3 I myself, therefore, do not worship anything that is inferior to the essence of God himself, since it is proper to accord divine honor only to the Absolute—to the ingenerate Father, the Son [begotten] of him, and the Holy Spirit [who proceeds] from the Father and through the Only-begotten, since nothing in the Trinity is created and falls within the province of causation. (4) For nothing in the Trinity is made from nothing, like other things, which fall within the province of causation and have causes.

And so, since the Trinity is without such a cause, it has inerrantly taught that it alone can be worshiped; for it alone is without a cause. (5) But all other things must be categorized as caused. For they are things which have been made and created, while the Father is uncreated, and he has a Son who is begotten of him but not created, and a Holy Spirit who proceeds from him and yet is not his handiwork.

44,6 Since this is the case the Son, who is worshiped, has not inherited[128] the suffering of his cause even though, in the Father, he has a Begetter. And neither has the Holy Spirit. And other things, the creatures, cannot be the cause of any inheritance without suffering [themselves], since they are created by the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. (7) But the Only-begotten—and his Holy Spirit—can plainly be the cause of inheritance

[128] πάθος κεκλήρωται αἰτίου. This is either a misunderstanding by Epiphanius of Aetius' vocabulary, or a simple association of ideas. The reference is to Aetius 27 which begins εἰ παντὶ γεννήτῳ αἰτία συγκεκλήρωται.

without suffering [themselves], for the Son is not a creature but an offspring and, since he has been begotten, will not inherit the causation of suffering. Neither will the Holy Spirit, since he proceeds from the Father. (8) For neither can the Father be classed as one who suffers in causing things because he has begotten [the Son], has sent the Holy Spirit forth from himself, and has created all the rest after the Son and the Spirit—though surely, all other things suffer in creating and begetting. (9) Therefore the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are uncaused; but the Trinity is the cause of all things, for it creates and fashions them jointly, meanwhile knowing that nothing within it is created or fashioned.

45,1 28. *If whatever is made, is made by something, but ingenerate being is made neither by itself nor by something else, "ingenerate" must denote essence.*

45,2 *Refutation.* To appear to be the inventor of a dialectical argument Aetius has come at me with this too, as though he were telling me something new and unheard of. There is simply no need for him to prove this particular thing. It is not in dispute, < its* > perennial < obviousness is not in contradiction* > to the truth, and it is confessed in the catholic church. (3) For "< If > whatever is made, is made by something else, but ingenerate being is made neither by itself nor by something else, 'ingenerate' must denote an essence." (4) What is more cogent than this? For Aetius has turned round and selected the term, "essence," which < is > regularly < rejected > by the Anomoeans themselves and the Arians, since he is plainly compelled by the truth to acknowledge it.

45,5 Ingeneracy, then, is an essence, and has generated the Only-begotten without defilement and without suffering, not in time and without beginning, not from non-existence but from itself. It has also sent the Holy Spirit forth, from itself and not from non-being. Therefore the holy Trinity is plainly declared co-essential by the orthodox teaching in the catholic church. But no created thing can be so termed, since neither by nature nor in divine majesty is it like the Only-begotten and the Holy Spirit. (6) Such things are created from nothing and cannot be worshiped, but the Trinity is eternal—the Father a perfect Father, the Son a perfect Son begotten of the Father, and the Spirit a perfect Spirit, proceeding from the Father and receiving of the Son. (7) And everything in the sacred scripture and the holy faith is crystal clear to us, and nothing is tortuous, contradictory or knotty.

46,1 29. *If the ingenerate being is implicitly indicated to be the cause of the Offspring's existence and, in contrast with every [other] cause, is invariable, it is incomparable essence in itself [and] its matchlessness is not implied*

for any reason external to itself but because, being ingenerate, it is incomparable and matchless in itself.

46,2 *Refutation.* Aetius attacks the same points many times, as I myself have said many times, and merely burdens me and nothing more. In the present instance I have had to add to my burden and repeat the same points to the same people, since Aetius has seen fit to do this. (3) For if the ingenerate being that begot is implied by the being of < the > offspring, the Begetter will not differ in rank from the Begotten < because of > begetting him. For he begot him of himself as an essence—spirit of spirit, and not body of body. Therefore the Begetter is implied to be incomparably well suited to the Begotten, and the Begotten to the Begetter. (4) For the Godhead needs no increment, or it would be called Father at one time but not at another. And neither can the Son be found < released* > from the heavenly bond (i.e., of the Trinity) by not being a Son at one time, but being a Son now. Thus God the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is of the same essence and not of different essences.[129] (5) For God is neither a kinsman nor a late arrival, but < a co-essential* Trinity >, with the name, "Father," ineffably well suited to the Son who is co-essential with him; and his Holy Spirit, who proceeds from the Father through the Son and < receives > what is the Son's, suitable to the Father and the Son.

46,6 Incomparability with all the creatures which are inferior to the Trinity and which have been created by the Trinity itself, is therefore characteristic of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. But the Trinity is not incomparable with itself, for it is uncreated, ingenerate and matchless. (7) Hence nothing can be equated with the Father, and nothing which has been made from non-existence and not begotten [by him] can be worshiped together with him. For he never said, "Sit thou on my right hand,"[130] to a creature. Nor, surely, did the Unbegotten say of any creature, "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father,"[131] "I am in the Father and the Father in me,"[132] and, "No man knoweth the Father save the Son, and the Son save the Father, and he to whom the Son will reveal him."[133] (8) But he reveals him through the Holy Spirit, who knows, teaches and

[129] So we render αὐτοουσία and ἑτεροουσία.
[130] Ps 109:1
[131] John 14:9.
[132] John 14:10.
[133] Matt 11:27.

proclaims what is the Son's in the world "and searcheth all things, even the deep things of God."[134]

46,9 This is why Christ said, "He that honoreth not the Son as he honoreth the Father, the wrath of God abideth on him."[135] And he didn't say, "He that honoreth not angels as he honoreth the Father,"—or, in turn, "He that honoreth the Son as well (as the Father)"—but, "He that honoreth not the Son *as* he honoreth the Father." And to show that the incomparability and matchlessness of the Trinity is in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, he likewise said, "It shall not be forgiven him that blasphemeth the Spirit, neither here nor in the world to come."[136]

47,1 30. *If the Almighty surpasses every nature, he surpasses it because of his ingeneracy, and this is the very reason for the permanence of generate things. But if "ingenerate" does not denote an essence, how will the nature of the generate things be preserved?*

47,2 *Refutation.* It is fitting to state and confess, and so hold fast to the doctrine that the Almighty, from whom the only-begotten divine Word and his Holy Spirit have inexpressibly come forth to us, surpasses all nature. (3) And therefore we surely do not acknowledge a creature as God, or we would be made fools of. But we glorify the Trinity which surpasses every nature, the Son with the Father, and the Holy Spirit, because of its ingeneracy and uncreatedness. (4) For since the Only-begotten and the Holy Spirit are not of another nature but are God of God and light of light, the Only-begotten too will be called, "Almighty," together with the Almighty Father, as the sacred scripture plainly says. (5) For the Only-Begotten's rank is not different from the Father's, as the holy apostle expressly testifies in the Holy Spirit when he says of the children of Israel, "of whom are the worship and the covenant and whose are the fathers, of whom according to the flesh is Christ, God above all, blessed for evermore, Amen."[137]

47,6 Therefore the Only-begotten is also fit for worship and is God, the Holy Spirit is the divine Spirit, and there is no other God after the holy Trinity. (7) Instead the Father is almighty and so is his only-begotten Child, Jesus Christ, who is fit for the Father's rank and is called the Father of the world to come.[138] And he is also fit for his Holy Spirit, and the Trinity is forever manifest and known in its uncreatedness. (8) Because of this

134 Cf. 1 Cor 2:10.
135 John 5:23; 3:36.
136 Matt 12:32.
137 Cf. Rom 9:4–5.
138 Isa 9:5 in some texts.

Trinity there is causation in all created things, and this is indicative of the perfect and incomparable essence—Father in Son, Son in Father with the Holy Spirit—which has eternal permanence in itself. For created things owe their preservation to this Trinity.

48,1 31. *If no invisible thing preexists itself in germ, but each remains in the nature allotted to it, how can the Ingenerate God, who is free from any category, sometimes see his own essence in the Offspring as secondary but sometimes see it in ingeneracy as prior, on the principle of "first and second?"*

48,2 *Refutation.* Aetius should give me warning of his questions in advance and put them clearly—especially this expression < he introduces >, (i.e., "in germ") which is reprehensible and in no way akin to his illustrations, since neither of the beings he has named can be equated with the other. For he has come to me with the names of many invisible beings.[139]

48,3 There are the spiritual invisible beasts, I mean the Seraphim and Cherubim, as well as angels, which are "spirits,"[140] and certain others of which it is true that nothing about them is "in germ."

48,4 For no one would say that invisible things are bodies, for they neither beget nor are begotten. Plainly, they were created in accordance with the will of the everlasting Godhead. Each creature has been assigned whatever virtue He Who Is has allotted it in the excellence of his generous lovingkindness, and each has received its allotted portion and abides by it. (5) And God is independent of all cause, contains all things, and does not have his Son—or his Holy Spirit—with hesitation, or regretfully after a lapse of time.

He has a Son in a way that befits the eternal possession of a Son begotten—and only-begotten—with the Father always within him; and he also has the Holy Spirit who is of the Father and receives of the Son, and has him everlastingly.

48,6 For the abundance of the everlasting Godhead does not depend on a lack of glory or the addition of glory. But while no creature is everlasting, when did the Trinity see itself with its abundance lessened, and see this at one time, but at another time see itself with an increase of essence, as though it needed it—and at still another time see itself with a further increase of glory or abundance after the creation of its creatures? (7) And in sum, < the nonsense* > of those who choose to bring forward and advance the speculations of human reasoning against the truth and

---

139 A sarcastic reference to the "invisible being" which "preexists itself in germ".

140 Cf. Ps 103:4; Heb 1:7; 14.

make them public, will do no harm. The rank of God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, surpasses all the understanding of angels and greater beings, let alone man's.

For human reasonings of are of no value, and men's thoughts are mortal because they skewer themselves on syllogisms and disputations. (8) Thus others have been condemned by their own arguments, and < have drawn inferences > from some quibbling speculation, some, about the origin of evil, others about the devil's origin or why he was made, others about God's purpose in creating man such that he would sin, others about God's reason for accusing man later after making him like that. (9) [All this] to learn, after ringing the changes on all their arguments, that they are mortal, and to ascribe majesty and knowledge to the < God who is glorified* > in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, that is, to the one Trinity—(10) after asking and receiving the knowledge of the true faith from him—and not to try to overstep their bounds. Instead they will learn to desist from blind reasoning, and not talk cleverly with their wagging tongues and foolish arguments, but be circumspect at the wise command of the holy and divine scripture which says "not to think more highly than they ought to think, but to think soberly."[141]

49,1 32. *If God retains an ingenerate nature, there can be no question of his knowing himself as [both] originated and unoriginated. If, on the other hand, we grant that his essence continues to be ingenerate and generate, he does not know his own essence, since his head is in a whirl from origination and non-origination. But if the Generate too partakes of ingenerate nature and yet remains without cessation in his generate nature, he knows himself in the nature in which he continues to remain, but plainly does not know his participation in ingeneracy; for he cannot possibly be aware of himself as both of ingenerate and generate essence.*

If, however, the Generate is contemptible because of its proneness to change, then unchangeable essence is a natural rank, since the essence of the Ingenerate admittedly transcends every cause.

49,2 *Refutation.* There is no doubt that God retains an ingenerate nature since he has created and made all things from nothing—the Father < who > begot from himself a Son who is co-essential with him and fit for his eternity, and [produced] the Holy Spirit who came forth from him with the suitability for co-essentiality with him. (3) And although the Trinity created all things, visible and invisible, from nothing, this does not mean that that which corresponds with God's rank, the eternity of

[141] Rom 12:3.

Him Who Is, is denied by the recent origin of the name of the creatures. (4) But the supreme essence on high is denied to the creatures, since it is not co-essential with them, but called them out of non-being into being.

Thus the Son, who has not been begotten of non-being but of Him Who Is, may properly be contemplated together [with God], for [God's] essence neither stretched nor shrank [in begetting him]. The Father, who is spirit, truly begot his Son as spirit, and produced the Holy Spirit from himself—and is neither unknowing of himself, nor aware of a shrinkage, a broadening or a division of his essence. (5) It makes no sense that God should not know all these [latter] things < of himself >, just as it is unaccountable that < the Son and the Spirit* >—that is, the Holy Spirit < that searches the depths of God* >—should not know the Godhead.

And the Ingenerate does not fail to share co-essentiality with his Offspring, nor the Generate to be eternal with the Father. (6) For the Father knows the Son and the Son knows the Father, since the Trinity remains endlessly uncreated and the Only-begotten is endless, for he is begotten of Him Who forever Is, and in his own perfect nature, himself truly Is. (7) He therefore knows himself. And neither is the Son ignorant of the ingenerate essence of the Father, nor the Ingenerate of the essence of the Son, for the only-begotten divine Word is worthy of credence when he says, "No man knoweth the Father save the Son, and the Son save the Father."[142]

49,8 Therefore never mind the pronouncement of this great Aetius, "He cannot possibly have knowledge of himself both as of ingenerate and as of generate essence." (9) The Only-begotten has already delivered his verdict in the form that follows, by saying that he and no one else knows the Father—(though at the same time he allows for the inclusion of the Holy Spirit, as he says elsewhere, 'The Spirit of the Father shall teach you."[143] But if the Spirit is the Spirit of the Father, he is not ignorant of the Father either.) (10) But by saying, "No man knoweth the Father save the Son,"[144] < the Son showed in the same breath* > that he always knows the Father—showing his own matchlessness, and the Father's and the Holy Spirit's matchlessness, in comparison with all other beings, which are not eternal but have been made.

49,11 But if he has already < said > that he always knows the Father, it is no use for Aetius to come tiptoeing in with his worthless teachings. For it is clear to everyone that he plainly thinks in human terms, and

142 Matt 11:27.
143 Luke 12:12; Matt 10:20.
144 Matt 11:27.

is condemned as fleshly and soulish by Him who knows himself, the Father and his Holy Spirit. (12) The Godhead, then, is exempt from all causation—not only the Father, but the Son and the Holy Spirit as well, since all are agreed that the Godhead of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit transcends every cause.

50,1 33. *If the Ingenerate transcends all cause but there are many ingenerates, they will [all] be exactly alike in nature. For without being endowed with some quality common [to all] while yet having some quality of its own—[a condition not possible in ingenerate being]—one ingenerate nature would not make, while another was made.*

50,2 *Refutation.* Of course the Unbegotten transcends all cause, since the Ingenerate is one and is an object of worship, but the object of worship is different from the worshipers. (3) But the Trinity is an object of worship because it is a unity and a Trinity enumerated in one name, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. And it includes nothing different from itself, but the Father has fittingly begotten, and not created, a Son. (4) For the Offspring is forever of the Begetter—as is the Holy Spirit who has come forth from him—since the Offspring is the < Son > of Him Who Is. The Trinity, then, exists in one uncreated unity, while all that has been created from nothing is caused by the Trinity itself. (5) The one Trinity is therefore one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, containing nothing different from itself: uncreated, unbegotten, unfashioned, a Trinity which is not made but makes, which includes the name of no creature but creates, which is one and not many. (6) And although they are many, all things are caused by it but are not enumerated with it.

Thus no share of the incomparable essence is allotted to any other nature. (7) There is therefore no created nature in the essence of God; God's essence is creative of all that cannot participate by co-essentiality in the incomparable—in the one essence of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. To one who has received the knowledge of the truth it is plain that the divine nature reveals this to him, < since > it alone is worshiped and not created things, just as it alone, and not created things, baptizes in its own name.

51,1 34. *If every essence is ingenerate, one will not differ from another in self-determination. How, then, can we say that one [such] being is changed and another causes change, when we will not allow God to bring them into being from an essence that has no [prior] existence!*

51,2 *Refutation.* Every opponent of the truth has gathered an amazing number of trivial sayings and expected to fall upon people, get them upset, remove them from the way of life, and ruin them. Aetius expects

to overawe the simple here although he is not really saying anything with this proposition. For he says what he says unnecessarily, and has employed the term, < "ingenerate" >, at this time, from his usual habit of trotting it out for no good reason.

51,3 The ingeneracy of every essence is not acknowledged even by the wise themselves, or every essence would be regarded as God. (4) But since not all essences are treated as God, but one rather than all—the one Godhead in Trinity—how can this fine fellow still suppose that an awe of him will overcome the sons of the truth? (5) One essence will differ from another because the Trinity creates them; but all things are created by the Trinity and it alone is self-determined, while all that it has made is determined by it. The latter sort of essence is changeable but the Trinity's essence is changeless, though it is constantly changing the things that are changed by it, and is able to bring their essences and subsistences out of nothing. (6) For it is fitting that God should transform as he wills the ordering of < the > things he has made, and has brought into being out of non-being and nothing.

52,1 35. *If every essence is ingenerate, every one is exactly alike. But the doing and suffering of an essence that is exactly like [all the others] must be attributed to chance. However, if there are many ingenerates which are exactly alike, there can be no enumeration of their ways of differing from one another. For there could be no enumerations of their differences, either in general or in some respect, since every difference which implies classification is already excluded from ingenerate nature.*

52,2 *Refutation.* Not every essence is ingenerate. It is foolish to think < this >, and whether Aetius intends it as a declaration or as a query, both the argument and its statement belong to pagan ignorance. But plainly, Aetius intends it as a query. (3) Then let him ask the pagans this, and let them agree with him that this follows from their argument; for they give the title, "matter," to something that is contemporaneous with God. And if Aetius agrees, let him get caught with them! The truth is that there is one Maker, which consists of one essence of a perfect Trinity, < which is >, and yet is not enumerated as an identity. But all other things are born and created, and not ingenerate.

52,4 But the Godhead is uncreated, with the Father begetting, the Son begotten, and the Holy Spirit sent forth from the Father himself and receiving of the Son, while all [other] things are created. Indistinguishability in power is properly confined to the Trinity. And all Godhead is ascribed to the Father because of the rightness and certainty of belief in one God, and the refutability of belief in many. But the rightness of the Son is fittingly reckoned in proportion to that of the Father and the Holy Spirit.

52,5 This being so, the device of the query will fail of its treacherous purpose from the start. There are not many indistinguishables; there is one Trinity in unity, and one Godhead in Trinity. (6) But all other things are separate, and their doing and suffering is not by chance. Nor can the holy Trinity suffer in doing a thing; the whole—I mean the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit—is impassible and worshipful. (7) For God made all things through a Son, but he did not make the Son—(the Son is not one of all the creatures, for he assists the Father and is worshiped together with him)—nor did he make the Holly Spirit. (The Holy Spirit is not one of the totality of God's creatures; he strengthens the power of all, and he is worshiped.) (8) But all things are subject to the providence of the One, and each one endures, acts, suffers and < does* > everything else < in accordance with the will of the One* >.

Thus the one Trinity is indistinguishable from itself but the other things, < which > it has made, are different from it. (9) It alone is eternal, uncreated and unbegotten—though the Son is begotten independently of time and without beginning, but ever existent and never ceasing to be. (10) Thus for safety's sake the word of God has taught that the Father is the head—and yet not the beginning—of the Son,[145] because of their co-essentiality. The Holy Spirit also, who has been sent forth from the Father, is with the Father forever and has had no beginning in time.

53,1 36. *If "ingenerate" and "God" are exact parallels and mean the same thing, the Ingenerate begot an Ingenerate. But if "ingenerate" means one thing while "God" means something else, there is nothing strange in God's begetting God, since one of the two receives being from ingenerate essence. But if, as is the case, that which is before God is nothing, "ingenerate" and "God" do mean the same, for "Offspring" does not admit of ingeneracy. Thus the Offspring does not permit himself to be mentioned in the same breath with his God and Father.*

53,2 *Refutation.* How does Aetius want me to grasp the meaning of the questions which are raised by his arguments? And if he says through arguments and syllogisms, my speculation will fail just like his. (3) For no one can ever out-argue God, nor, as the scripture says, "shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?"[146] But by pious reasoning and the right confirmation of it one must return, by means of the holy scripture, to the teaching of the Holy Spirit.

---

145 Cf. 1 Cor 11:3.
146 Rom 9:20.

53,4 Now since an unalterable pronouncement teaches us that those who worship a creature have been made fools, how can it not be < foolish > to take a creature for God and worship and honor it, when faith by its nature denies worship to the creature and the creature to worship. (5) Indeed, there will be no advantage in Christianity if it is in no way different from those who give divine honor to the creature. Such faith will be idolatry rather than piety.

53,6 For they too worship the sun, the moon and the heavenly bodies, heaven and earth, and the other created things. And the superiority of [certain] created things arouses no awe, and even if one creature is outweighed by the other the special character [of one creature] will not set it apart from the honor that is common to them all because of their common name (i.e., "creature"). There is One who has made both [of the creatures being compared], and has allotted each, not a difference of name but a difference of essence.

53,7 For in the case of all created things the creature's name is "servitor," not "free." And if the servitor in any part [of creation] is worshiped, the worship [of it] will be no different from [the worship of] any other part, even if it is inferior. For it is the same as the most exalted part, by its kinship with the creature which has been made to be, after non-being, by Him Who Is.

53,8 "Ingenerate" is therefore a fit name for God, and "God" for the ingenerate. Thus we do not call the Offspring a product or artifact, but an offspring begotten essentially and without spot of the Father, co-essential with the Father and fit to be worshiped with him. And neither do we call the Holy Spirit, who is of him, different; he too is fit to be worshiped. (9) But the word, "God," is not uttered in the same breath with any other being, a creature, since the creature has been made different from ingeneracy because it has been allotted being after non-being. The Trinity, however, is eternal, and "God" and "Ingenerate" are not different things.

53,10 But your admission, Aetius, that the Son has been begotten of the Father, is deceptive and not sincere. Whatever is begotten is not created, and whatever is created is not begotten. But if a begotten thing is created, it is created in a different way, as, for example, men beget men but do not create them, since they themselves have been created by God on high. Thus the things they beget have been begotten by them, but all things have been created by God.

53,11 Now since God is uncreated but has begotten—not created—a Son, he begets nothing different from his own essence. How can his

Offspring be created, then, when the Father is uncreated? If he calls the Offspring a creature, it cannot be called an Offspring.

And there is a great deal to say against such an absurd speculation. (12) But it does not become even God to be without a Son at one time, and be called "Father" later, after [begetting] a Son. Nor is it becoming to the Son that there be a time before him; if there is, the time will be greater than his greatness. (13) But the perpetual possession of unfailingness and eternity, in the identity of their qualities, is becoming to the Father. And nothing was before God, this is plain. It can be shown, then, that "God" and "Ingenerate" are the same, as Aetius has said; and in somehow implicating these with each other Aetius accuses himself rather than proving his point. (14) For if "God" is used together with God, as it is, "ingenerate" is also an acceptable term for the "Begotten Son"; ingeneracy is implicit in God. (15) The divine Word is mentioned in the same breath with the Father because of his Godhead, uncreatedness, and joint honor with the Father, even though this is of no help to Aetius; for all creatures worship the Son, and "every tongue confesses that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father,"[147] to whom be glory, the Father in the Son with the Spirit, unto the ages of ages. Amen.

54,1 *Aetius' closing valediction*

37. *May the true God, who is ingenerate in himself*[148] *and for this reason is alone addressed as "the only true God" by his messenger, Jesus Christ, who truly came into being before the ages and is truly a generate entity, preserve you, men and women, safe and sound, from impiety in Christ Jesus our Savior, through whom be all glory to our God and Father, both now and forever, and to the ages of ages. Amen.*

54,2 *Refutation.* Even at the close of Aetius' letter to his gang whom he addressed as "male and female champions," he did not desist from this sort of verbal wickedness. In his valediction too he gave proof of the strangeness of his doctrine. (3) For he says, "The true self-begotten God preserve you safe and sound," and without realizing that with one word he has destroyed all the implications of his inquiry. He spoke of the "Ingenerate God" in the propositions above, but by introducing a "self-begotten God" to us here he has made no allowance for < God's uncausedness* >

147 Cf. Phil 2:11.

148 Wickham αὐτὸ ἀγέννητος, Dummer αὐτοαγέννητος, Holl and MSS αὐτογέννητος. This last cannot be what Aetius wrote, but is plainly what Epiphanius read.

and the fact that he did not make himself. For every < evil > notion forgets itself, the better to be detected.

54,4 Next he says, "he who for this reason is alone addressed as 'the only true God.' " But going by what Aetius says and thinks, he is either keeping the Son from being "God," and misrepresenting the name < because he wants > to be called a Christian, or else he believes that the Son is God but not a true one. And [in that case] he will have one true God, and one who is not true. (5) And because Aetius finds one Person below another in a descending order and assigns the Holy Spirit a still lower and inferior rank—or again, will hold that the Spirit is a lesser "God" or not count him as one of the Trinity—the pathetic object will be an entire stranger to Christians. May he be denounced in the end as a complete pagan and Sadducee, a stranger—as he is—to the Holy Spirit, and comparable to the pagans in his lot. (6) For he claims that there is one greater and one lesser God, one true God and one not true. The pagans confess that one God is supreme but call the others lesser. But the sacred scripture plainly confounds him. It says that the Father is "the true God",[149] and likewise says "God" of the Son[150]—and it says, "God is light,"[151] of the Father, and "He was the true light"[152] of the Son. And of the Holy Spirit it says, "the Spirit of truth."[153] Thus the Trinity is truly proclaimed to us in "wisdom and the depth of its riches."[154]

54,7 Next after this he even says, "by his messenger, Jesus Christ." He was not ashamed to regard the Only-begotten as unworthy of the name of God, but employed the mere verbal title, just as, in the above propositions, he accorded the Son the honor of the divine name only verbally.

54,8 However, he says, "who truly came into being and is of a nature truly generate," but says, "He will keep you from impiety." Any loose woman attributes her behavior to others from the start. Not seeing how great his impiety has been, he believes himself pious, as madmen suppose themselves sane but the others crazy.

54,9 But here < in writing >, "in Christ Jesus," he did not dare to acknowledge him as "our Lord," but deceptively called him "our Savior." (10) And he says, "through whom be all glory to < our God and > Father, now and

149 John 17:3.
150 1 John 1:5.
151 1 John 1:1.
152 John 1:9.
153 John 16:13.
154 Cf. Rom 11:33.

forever and unto the ages of ages. Amen." Even "*all* glory" is meant to strip the Son of honor and glory. May none of the pious, who have received the gift of the true faith from the Holy Spirit, ever acquiesce in this!

54,11 But now that I have discussed all these things that Aetius has said in thirty-six syllogistic propositions with a certain skill in debate and the inferential guesswork of human trickery, (12) I urge you to read them[155] attentively, and you will know his earth-bound nonsense at once, Christian people, servants of Christ and sons of the truth, which has nothing to do with the teaching of the Holy Spirit. (13) Aetius did not dare to mention the word of God even in one paragraph, or any text of the Old or the New Testament—not from the Law, the Prophets, the Gospels or the Apostles. He did not dare quote a line of the patriarchs', of the Savior himself; never one of the Father's, not one oracle of the Holy Spirit delivered through apostles or prophets. He thus stands fully self-exposed, to the friends of the truth, as an entire stranger to God and his faith.

54,14 I believe that I have opposed his propositions, as best I can even in untrained speech, but that I have confronted him with proof from the sacred scriptures, and from pious reason itself. (15) And since I have discussed the faith clearly enough in my refutations of him I feel that this will do, so as not to create any further difficulty in reading by making additions.

54,16 But once more, < I shall mention and indicate* > a few of the ideas < he introduced* > in his vanity, after his foreign creed and his hatred of Christ and his Holy Spirit, and take up, and briefly state and discuss, all the < foolishness* > his mouth, and his disciples' mouths, dared to utter in his arrogant pride and inordinate blasphemy.

54,17 For with their idea of knowing God not by faith but by actual knowledge, he and his disciples were the most deluded of all. I mentioned somewhere above that they say they do not simply know God with the knowledge of faith, but as one might know anything which is visible and tangible. As one might pick up a rock or club, or a tool made of some other material, so this good chap says, "I know God as well as I know myself, and do not know myself as well as I know God."

54,18 But in the end, talking and hearing nonsense is a deception to many, but a joke to the wise. For what person who has contracted insanity and gone mad can fail to drive others mad, particularly his followers and subjects? (19) Suppose someone demanded of him and his pupils,

---

[155] Holl <αὐτ>οῖς, MSS οἷς. Holl's alternative suggestion is νῦν τέλος τίθεμεν τῷ λόγῳ.

"Don't tell me that you know the incomparable, incomprehensible God, whose form cannot be perceived, but who is known to his servants by faith! Describe the foundations of the earth to me, the storehouses of the abyss, the veins of the sea, the location of hades, the dimensions of the air, the form and thickness of the heavens! Tell me what the top of the heavens is, the bottom of the underworld, what is to the right, what is to the left of creation! Tell me how you yourself were made, and the number and dimensions of the innumerable things on earth!" (20) Then after hearing this, as some of their dupes have told me, his disciples resort to quibbling excuses and finally say deceitfully, "All these things are physical, and we cannot know them. But we know clearly what sort of God made them, how he is, what he is like, and who he is."

54,21 But who can hear this without at once laughing at them? It is sheer foolishness to say that one knows, and has accurately described, the incomparable, ineffable Artificer. And if only Aetius would say that he knows and has described him by faith, and he and they would not venture to say that they know him by a sort of direct knowledge! But the things the incomparable God himself has made, and which, because of their innumerable < kinds* >, can < only* > be wondered at by those who see them, he says that he and his followers do not know. (22) And most of all, the sacred scriptures everywhere plainly declare that God is invisible, incomprehensible and beyond our understanding, but that it is known only by faith "that he is, and that he is the rewarder of them that love him."[156]

54,23 But when anyone with an orthodox view of God's glory, faith, love and incomprehensibility tells them, "We know that God is incomprehensible, we know that God is invisible, ineffable, but we know that, in his invisibility and incomprehensibility, he actually is," this exponent of the new dialectic dares < to reply* > with light mockery, as though to tell a story, (24) "What are you and your faith like? Like a deaf, dumb and blind virgin who's been violated. Everyone who knows her can see that she has, but if they ask who her seducer is, she can't hear to know they're asking. And she hasn't seen her seducer because she's blind, and can't say who he is because she's dumb."

54,25 Now the reverse is true of him and his story, for as the scripture says, "His travail shall return on his own head, and he shall fall into the pit which he hath made,"[157] and the like. (26) Aetius himself is like a man

[156] Heb 11:6.
[157] Ps 7:17; 16.

who was born blind but can speak—indeed, speaks at length—and can hear, and knows the names of white and black, hyacinth, light green, red and the various other colors, and light and dark, and has been told their names. But he surely has no knowledge of their appearance and cannot possibly describe it, because he was born blind to begin with, and does not know the variation and appearance of the qualities of the colors. (27) The reality which answers to the distinction between each of their names is experienced by visual perceptions, but never by verbal explanation to one who does not know their appearance to start with, or by handling and touch. (28) So when people who are blind from birth talk about them and know enough to contrast black with white, and green with hyacinth, purple, scarlet and the other colors, but we ask them the quality of their appearance and the color of each quality, they cannot say, and cannot learn it from us. They can only convince each other by talking, but they deceive their hearers as though they know all about the distinction, even though they are describing < the indescribable* > in words and are ignorant because of their inability to comprehend it.

54,29 Even so Aetius himself, who jokes about the seduction of the deaf, dumb and blind virgin, has come to me to talk about God. In fact, going by his blasphemy, it is he who has been spoiled, and his ignorance is like blindness from birth, (30) because he talks about God but by describing < the indescribable > in words, and ends even by making his disciples shameless.

For there is nothing that they do not dare. When they are under cross-examination by someone and are hard pressed, they blaspheme the names of prophets and apostles and leave at once, turning away with the words, "The apostle said this as a man," but sometimes, "Why quote the Old Testament to me?" (31) But this is no surprise in view of the Savior's words, "If they have called the master of the house Beelzebul, how much more them of his household."[158] If they deny the Lord himself and his true glory, how much more his prophets and apostles?

54,32 But his disciples have been inspired to still further madness, as has their successor, a person miscalled Eunomius (i.e., "law-abiding"), who is still alive to be a great evil, < and introduces* > another piece of impudence. For he rebaptizes persons already baptized—not only people who come to him from the orthodox and the sects, but even from the Arians. (33) He, however, rebaptizes them in the name of God the Uncreated, and

[158] Matt 10:25.

in the name of the Created Son, and in the name of the Sanctifying Spirit created by the Created Son. (34) And to make it clear that it is no longer faith which their whole workshop of jugglery, theater and farce proclaims, but practically clowns' work, some maintain that he baptizes his candidates for rebaptism upside down, with their feet on top and their heads below. (35) And while they are in this position he obliges them to swear an oath that they will not abandon the sect he has cooked up. (36) But they say that when this same Aetius had been recalled from exile after Constantius' death by Julian on his accession to the throne, and when he was still a deacon in his sect, he was raised to the episcopate by a bishop of his sect.

54,37 This is < the > information I have < about > Aetius and his disciples, to whom some have given the name of Anomoean because he has come to an opinion still more frightful than the heresy of Arius. (38) With God's help I have gone through his doctrines in detail as best I can, as though I had stamped on the serpent called the many-footed millipede, or wood-louse, with the foot of the truth, and crushed it with the true confession of the Only-begotten. Giving our accustomed thanks to God, beloved, and summoning his power to the aid of our weakness, let us go on to the remaining sects (39) to the best of my ability and understanding, and call, as I said, on our Master himself, to come to my aid in the exposure of the sects and the refutation of them, so that, by his power, I may be able to keep the promise which, despite my unimportance and mediocrity, I have made.

ANACEPHALAEOSIS VII

Here too are the contents of the second Section of this same Volume Three. By the division of the Sections which we have been using, it is a seventh Section. It is Section Seven and the end of the whole work, and contains four Sects:

< 77 >. Dimoerites, also called Apollinarians, who do not confess that Christ's humanity is complete. Some of them at one time dared to say that Christ's body is co-essential with his Godhead, some denied that he ever took a soul, but some, in reliance on the text, "The Word was made flesh,"[1] denied that Christ received his fleshliness from created flesh, that is, from Mary. They merely said contentiously that the Word was made flesh; but after that they say, I do not know with what intent, that he has not received a mind.

< 78 >. Antidicomarians, who say that the holy, ever-virgin Mary had relations with Joseph after bearing the Savior.

< 79 >. Collyridians, who offer a loaf in the name of this same Mary on a certain set day of the year. I have given them a name to correspond with their practice, and called them Collyridians.

< 80 >. A group < called > Massalians, which means, "people who pray." Of the sects current among pagans, the following, called Euphemites, Martyrians and Satanists, are associated with them.

This is the summary of the seventh Section, and the end of the three Volumes. There are eighty Sects in all. At the very end of the third Volume, and after Section Seven, is the Faith of the Catholic Church, the Defense of Truth, the Proclamation of the Gospel of Christ, and the Character of the Catholic and Apostolic Church which has been in existence from all ages, but which, in time, was made fully manifest by Christ's incarnation.

---

[1] John 1:14.

Against Dimoerites, called < Apollinarians >[1] by some, who do not confess that Christ's humanity is complete. 57, but 77 of the series

1,1 Though it is painful to me in the anticipation, directly after these another doctrine different from the faith sprang up. I cannot tell with what intent, but it was to make sure that the devil would not leave < the church untroubled* >, for he is constantly disturbing the human race and, as it were, warring on it, by putting his bitter poisons into its choice foods. And as though he were dumping its bitterness into honey, < he is introducing the heresy* > even through people who are admired for their exemplary lives and always renowned for their orthodoxy. (2) For this is the work of the devil, who envied our father Adam at the beginning and is the enemy of all men—as certain wise men have said, envy is always the opponent of great successes.[2] (3) And so, not to leave me and God's holy church untroubled but constantly in an uproar and under siege, the devil planted certain occasions for [it] even through persons of importance.

1,4 For certain persons—people, indeed, who were originally ours, who held high position, and who have always been esteemed by myself and all orthodox believers, have seen fit to remove the mind from Christ's human nature and say that our Lord Christ took flesh and a soul at his coming, but not a mind—that is, that he did not take full humanity. (5) I cannot say how they have contributed to the world with this, or who of their predecessors they learned it from—or what benefit they have derived from it or conferred on me, on their hearers, and on God's holy church, by causing us nothing but disturbance and division among ourselves, and grief, and the loss of our mutual affection and love. (6) For they have abandoned the following and the righteousness of the sacred scriptures, and the simple profession—the faith of the prophets, Gospels and apostles—and introduced a sophistical, fictitious doctrine, and a series of many dreadful teachings with it, so that they are examples of the scripture, "They shall turn away from sound doctrine and give heed unto fables and empty words."[3]

---

[1] The chief literary source of this Sect is Athanasius' Epistle to Epictetus the bishop of Corinth, which is quoted in full at 3–13. Also quoted is the Apologia of Paulinus of Antioch, a document composed by Athanasius (21, 1–8). The Apollinarian controversy was one in which Epiphanius was closely involved.

[2] Cf. Pindar, Pythian Odes 7.14–15: "I feel some rejoicing at a new success (ἐμποψία); but I am grieved that envy is the requital for good works."

[3] 2 Tim 4:3; 1 Tim 1:4.

2,1 It was the elderly and venerable Apollinarius of Laodicea, whom I, the blessed Pope Athanasius, and all the orthodox had always loved, who originally thought of this doctrine and put it forward. (2) When some of his disciples told me about it I did not at first believe that a man like himself had introduced this doctrine to the world, and I waited patiently, with hopeful expectation, till I could learn the facts of the matter. (3) For I thought that his pupils who were coming to me from him had not understood the profound < utterances > of so well educated and wise a man and teacher, and had not learned this from him but had made it up on their own. (4) For even among the ones who were visiting me, a great deal was in dispute. Some of them dared to say that Christ had brought his body down from on high. But the heresy stayed in people's heads and drove them to shocking lengths, for others denied the doctrine that Christ had received a soul. (5) But some even dared to say that Christ's body was co-essential with his Godhead, and threw the east into great turmoil; it became necessary to call a council on their account and condemn persons of this kind.

2,6 Minutes were taken, moreover, and copies of them sent to the blessed Pope Athanasius. Because of the minutes the blessed Pope was obliged to write an Epistle himself against people who say such things, in which he harshly reproved the most venerable bishop Epictetus for even deigning to make a reply about this to the trouble-makers. (7) In the same letter the blessed Pope wrote plainly about the faith, and denounced those who were saying those things and making trouble. I feel obliged to present a copy of this letter here, in its entirety. It is as follows:

Athanasius the bishop of Alexandria to Epictetus the bishop of Corinth

3,1 *I had believed that every worthless doctrine of all sectarians, however many there are, had been brought to an end by the council that convened at Nicaea. For the faith confessed by the fathers there, in conformity with the holy scriptures, is sufficient for the overthrow of all impiety and the commendation of the godly faith in Christ.* (2) *And therefore, when various councils were held just lately in Gaul,*[4] *Spain and the metropolis of Rome,*[5] *all the participants, as though moved by one spirit, unanimously condemned those who still secretly held the opinions of Arius, I mean Auxentius of Milan and*

[4] The Synod of Paris, ca. 360 A.D. Cf. Hilarius Fr. 11.1–4.
[5] For the Council of Rome, see Soz. 6.23.7–15; Theod. H. E. 2.22.3–12.

Ursacius, Valens and Gaius of Pannonia. (3) *But because such persons contrive so-called councils of their own, [the participants in the orthodox councils] have written everywhere that none but the council of Nicaea alone is to be termed a council of the catholic church—the monument of victory over every sect, especially the Arian, on whose account the council was chiefly called at that time.*

3,4 *After so much [of this sort], how can anyone still undertake to doubt or dispute? If they are Arians, it would be no surprise that they complain of writings against themselves, just as, when they hear, "The idols of the heathen are silver and gold, the work of men's hands,"*[6] *pagans consider the teaching concerning the Holy Spirit'*[7] *foolishness.* (5) *But if it is persons who appear to be orthodox and to love the fathers' pronouncements who wish to revise them by disputation, they do nothing else than to "give their neighbor a foul outpouring to drink,"*[8] *as scripture says, and to dispute about words, to no purpose but the overthrow of the simple.*

4,1 *I write in this way after reading the minutes your Reverence has taken. They ought not even to have been put in writing so as to leave not even a memory of these matters to posterity. For who has ever heard of such things? Who has taught or learned them?* (2) *"For from Zion shall go forth the word of the Lord, and the Law of God from Jerusalem;"*[9] *but where have these things come from?* (3) *What hell spewed forth the doctrine that "< the > body taken from Mary is co-essential with the Word's divine nature,"*[10] *or, "The Word was transformed into flesh, bones, hair and the rest of the body,*[11] *and changed from his own nature?"*[12]—(4) *Who has ever heard Christians say that "The Son was clothed with a body by attribution, not nature?" Who has been so impious as both to say and to believe that "His divine nature, which was itself co-essential with the Father, has been curtailed, and from perfect*

---

[6] Ps 113:12.

[7] Holl ἁγίου πνεύματος, MSS θείου σταυροῦ.

[8] Hab 2:15.

[9] Isa 2:3.

[10] Apollinarius specifically says that Christ's flesh was not from heaven, cf. 1 Ep. Dion. 13 (Lietzmann p. 259); Fr. 164 (Lietzmann p. 259); Fr. 163 (Lietzmann p. 255). Timotheus the Apollinarian, however, calls "The Lord's flesh . . . co-essential with God," Fr. 181 (Lietzmann p. 279); cf. Apollinarius himself at De Unione 8 (Lietzmann p. 188).

[11] This might be a hostilely worded statement of Apollinarius' doctrine that Christ is μία φύσις., cf. Apol. 1 Ep. Dion. 2 (Lietzmann p. 257).

[12] Apollinarius appears to say the opposite at Epist. Dion. 10, "The one thing partakes of the other which differs from it in name (i.e., the Godhead and manhood of Christ, which are both the same Christ), not by the incorporeal's changing into the corporeal, or the corporeal's changing into the incorporeal . . . "

become imperfect; and that which was nailed to the tree was not the body, but the very creative essence of wisdom?"[13] (5) *And who can hear, "The Lord produced his passible body by transformation, not from Mary but from his own essence," and suppose that a Christian is saying this?*

4,6 *And who conceived of this wicked impiety, so as even to think of saying "Whoever says that the Lord's body is from Mary no longer believes in a Trinity in the Godhead, but in a quaternity >?"*[14] *In other words, persons who hold such views are saying that the flesh which the Savior assumed from Mary is of the essence of the Trinity.* (7) *And again, from what source have certain persons spewn forth an equal impiety, so as to say, "Christ's body is not younger than the Godhead of the Lord but is forever begotten in coeternity with him, since it arose from wisdom?"*[15] (8) *But why have persons called Christians even presumed to doubt that the Lord who came forth from Mary is the Son of God in essence and nature, but that, humanly speaking he is of the seed of David and St. Mary's flesh?* (9) *Who, then, have become so audacious as to say, "The Christ who suffered and was crucified in the flesh is not Lord, Savior, God and Son of the Father?"* (10) *Or how can people wish to be called Christians who say, "The Word has come to a holy man as to one of the prophets, and has not become man himself by taking his body from Mary?*[16] *Christ is one thing; the Son of God, the Son of the Father before Mary and before all ages, is another?" Or how < can > people be Christians who say, "The Son is one person, and the Word of God is another?"*

5,1 *These things were said in various ways in your minutes, but their intent is one and the same, and looks to impiety. Because of them, persons who plume themselves on the confession of the fathers at Nicaea have been differing and disputing with one another.* (2) *I am astonished that your Reverence has put up with it, and has not stopped them from saying these things and expounded the orthodox creed to them, so that they may either hear it and be still, or dispute it and be recognized as sectarians.* (3) *For*

---

[13] Cf. Frag. 186 (Lietzmann p. 319), where Felix of Rome says, "We curse those who ascribe the sufferings to the Godhead, and those who call Christ a crucified man and do not confess that he was crucified in his whole divine hypostasis."

[14] Cf. Apol. Quod Unus Sit Deus 3.4 (Lietzmann pp. 295–297).

[15] A theologian hostile to Apollinarius might draw this conclusion from such passages as De Unione 1, (Lietzmann pp. 185–186), "There was a descent from heaven, not merely a birth from a woman. For scripture says not only, 'Made of a woman, made under the Law,' but likewise, 'No man hath ascended to heaven save he that came from heaven, the Son of Man.' " Cf. De Unione 9 (Lietzmann pp. 188–189).

[16] Apollinarius consistently denies this doctrine: ἡ κατὰ μέρος πίστις 6 (Lietzmann p. 169); Frs. 14; 15 (Lietzmann pp. 208; 209); Fr. 51 (Lietzmann p.216); Ep. Dioc. 2 (Lietzmann p. 256).

the statements I have quoted are not to be said or heard among Christians, but are in every way foreign to the teaching of the apostles. (4) *For my part, I have had their statements inserted baldly in my letter, as I have said, so that one who merely hears them may observe the shame and impiety in them.* (5) *And even though one ought to accuse them at greater length and expose the shame of those who harbor these thoughts, it would be better still to end my letter here and write no more.* (6) *It is not right to investigate further and expend more effort on things whose wrongness has been so plainly revealed, or the contentious may think that they are matters open to doubt. In reply to such statements it is enough to say simply that they are not of the catholic church, and that the fathers did not believe them.* (7) *But lest the inventors of evils take shameless occasion from my complete silence, it will be well to mention a few passages from the sacred scriptures. For perhaps if they are embarrassed even in this way, they will desist from these filthy notions.*

6,1 *What has possessed you people to say, "The homoousion is the body of the Word's Godhead?"*[17] *For it is best to begin with this proposition in order that, from the demonstration of its unsoundness, all the rest may be shown to be the same.*

6,2 *It is not to be found in the scriptures, for they say that God has become incarnate in a human body. Furthermore, the fathers who met at Nicaea said, not that the body, but the Son himself is co-essential with the Father. And they confessed that the Son is of the Father's essence, but that— again, in accordance with the scriptures—his body is of Mary.* (3) *Therefore, either reject the Council of Nicaea < and > introduce these opinions as sectarians; or, if you desire to be the children of the fathers, do not believe otherwise than they have written.*

6,4 *Indeed, your absurdity can be seen from the following consideration as well. If the Word is co-essential with the body whose substance is of the earth, but the Word is co-essential with the Father in accordance with the fathers' confession, then the Father himself is co-essential with the body whose origin is of the earth.* (5) *And why do you still blame the Arians for calling the Son a creature, when you yourselves say that the Father is co-essential with created things, and—passing over to another impiety—that "The Word has been transformed into flesh, bones, hair, sinews and the whole body, and changed from his own nature?"* (6) *The time has come for you to say openly that he*

[17] This might be a pardonable misunderstanding of Apollinarius' doctrine as it is stated, for example, at De Unione 8 (Lietzmann p. 188), "Thus he is both co-essential with God in his invisible spiritual nature, although the flesh is included in the term, since it is united with the Son's co-essentiality with God . . . "

is made of earth; for the substance of the bones, and of the whole body, is made of earth.

6,7 *What is this madness, of such severity that you even contradict yourselves? For by saying that the Word is co-essential with his body you distinguish the one from the other, but you imagine a change of the Word himself by his transformation into flesh.* (8) *And who will put up with you further if you so much as say these things? You have leaned farther towards impiety than any sect. If the Word is co-essential with his body mention of Mary is superfluous, and there is no need of her. If, as you say, the Word is co-essential with his body, the body is capable of existing eternally even before Mary, just as is the Word himself.* (9) *Indeed, what need is there for the Word's advent, either to assume something co-essential with himself or to be altered from his own nature and become a body? For the Godhead does not lay hold of itself, to assume something that is co-essential with it.* (10) *Nor did the Word, who atones for the sins of others, sin and so that, turned into a body, he could offer himself as a sacrifice for himself and atone for himself.*

7,1 *But none of this is so, perish the thought! "He took part of the seed of Abraham," as the apostle said, "wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren"*[18] *and take a body like ours.* (2) *Thus Mary is indeed the foundation [of his body], so that he took it from her and offered it, for us, as his own. And Isaiah indicated Mary by prophecy when he said, "Behold, the Virgin shall conceive and bear."*[19] *And Gabriel was sent to her—not simply "to a virgin," but "to a virgin espoused to a man,"*[20] *to show Mary's true humanity through her suitor.* (3) *And scripture mentions her "bringing forth,"*[21] *and says, "She wrapped him in swaddling clothes,"*[22] *and, "Blessed were the paps which he hath sucked."*[23] *And a sacrifice was offered, as though for a son who had "opened the womb."*[24] *But these are all tokens of a virgin's giving birth.*

7,4 *And Gabriel surely did not simply tell her, "that which is conceived 'in' thee,"*[25] *or it might be supposed that a body had been introduced into her from without. He said, "that which is born 'of thee,'"*[26] *so that it might be*

---

[18] Heb 2:16–17.
[19] Isa 7:14.
[20] Luke 1:27.
[21] Luke 1:31.
[22] Luke 2:7.
[23] Luke 11:27.
[24] Luke 2:23.
[25] Cf. Matt 1:20.
[26] Luke 1:35.

believed that the child, when born, was actually born 'of her.' Nature shows this plainly besides, for the body of a virgin who has not given birth cannot have milk, and a body cannot be nourished with milk or wrapped in swaddling clothes without first being actually born.

7,5 *This is the body that was "circumcised the eighth day."*[27] *Simon "took" this "up in his arms."*[28] *This became "a child and grew,"*[29] *reached the age of twelve, and attained his thirtieth year.* (6) *For "the very essence of the Word" was not "changed and curtailed," as some have supposed, for it is changeless and unalterable as the Savior himself says, "See that it is I, and I am not changed."*[30] *And Paul writes, "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today and forever."*[31] (7) *But the impassible and incorporeal Word of God was in the body that was circumcised, was carried in its mother's arms, ate, grew weary, was nailed to the tree and suffered.* (8) *This body was laid in the tomb when Christ himself "went to preach to the spirits that were in prison,"*[32] *as Peter said.*

8,1 *This above all reveals the folly of those who say that the Word was changed to bones and flesh. If this were so there would be no need of a tomb. The body itself would have gone of itself to preach to the spirits in hades.* (2) *As it is, Christ himself went to preach, but "Joseph wrapped" the body "in a linen shroud, and laid it to rest"*[33] *on Golgotha. And it has been shown to all that the body was not the Word, but the Word's body.*

8,3 *And Thomas handled this body once it was risen from the dead, and saw in it "the prints of the nails"*[34]*—the sight of which nails the Lord had endured as they were hammered into his own body, and did not prevent although he could have. Instead he, the Incorporeal, claimed the characteristics of the body for his own.* (4) *Of course he said, "Why smitest thou me?"*[35] *as though he himself had been hurt, when he was struck by the servant. And though by nature he was intangible, he still said, "I gave my back to the scourges, and hid not my face from spitting."*[36] (5) *For what the Word's human nature suffered, the Word united with the human*

---

[27] Cf. Luke 2:21.
[28] Luke 2:28.
[29] Luke 2:40.
[30] Cf. Luke 24:39 (Mal 3:6).
[31] Heb 13:8.
[32] 1 Pet 3:19.
[33] Mark 15:46.
[34] John 20:25.
[35] John 18:23.
[36] Isa 50:6.

nature imputed to himself, so that we might participate in the Word's divine nature.

8,6 *And it was a paradox that the one who suffered was the same as the one who did not suffer. He suffered in that his own body suffered, and he was in the very body that suffered; but since the Word, who is God by nature, is impassible, he did not suffer.* (7) *And the Incorporeal himself was in the passible body, while the body had within it the impassible Word, nullifying the weaknesses of the body itself.* (8) *But he did this, and became what he was, in order to assume our characteristics, nullify them by offering them in sacrifice, and finally, by enduing us with his own characteristics, enable the apostle to say, "This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality."*[37]

9,1 *But this was not done by attribution as some, in their turn, have surmised, perish the thought! Since the Savior became true man, he truly became the salvation of man as a whole.* (2) *If the Word were < in > the body by attribution, as they say, and something which is said to be by attribution is imaginary, both men's salvation and their resurrection must be called [only] apparent, as the most impious Mani teaches.*

9,3 *But our salvation has by no means been imaginary, or a salvation of the body alone. The salvation of man as a whole, soul and body, has truly been accomplished in Christ.* (4) *Therefore the Savior's true body, which he received from Mary as the sacred scriptures teach, is really human. But it was a true body because it was the same as ours. For since all of us were Adam's descendants, Mary is our sister.*

9,5 *And no one can doubt this if he recalls what Luke wrote. For after the resurrection from the dead, when some thought that they were not beholding the Lord in the body he had taken from Mary but were seeing a spirit in its place, he said, "See my hands and feet, and the prints of the nails, that it is I myself. Handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he showed them his hands and his feet."*[38] (6) *From this, again, those who dare to say that the Lord was changed into flesh and bones can be refuted. He did not say, "as ye see me 'be' flesh and bones," but "'have' flesh, and bones," so that there can be no question of the Word himself being changed into these things. It must be believed that he himself was 'in' these things, both before his death and after his resurrection.*

---

[37] 1 Cor 15:53.
[38] Luke 24:39–40.

10,1 *But since these things can be proved in this way, there is no need to deal with the rest and enter into any discussion of them.* (2) *For as the body in which the Word was is not co-essential with the divine nature but truly born of Mary; and as the Word himself was not changed into bones and flesh, but became incarnate in the flesh*—(3) *for this is the sense of the words in John, "The Word became flesh,"*[39] *as can be learned from a similar passage. For it is written in Paul, "Christ became a curse for us."*[40] *And as Christ did not himself become a curse, but [it is said] that he became a curse because he assumed the curse for us, so he became flesh, not by turning into flesh, but by assuming flesh for us and becoming man.*

10,4 *For*—*once more*—*to say, "The Word was made flesh," is the equivalent of saying that he became man, as is said in the Book of Joel, "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh."*[41] *< For > the promise did not < extend > to animals but is for men, for whom, indeed, the Lord became man.* (5) *And since this is the meaning of this text, those who have supposed that "The flesh that came from Mary was before Mary, and the Word had a human soul before her and had always been in it before his advent," must surely with good reason condemn themselves.* (6) *Those too who have said, "His flesh is not subject to death, but is of an immortal nature," will cease to say so. For if Christ did not die, how could Paul "deliver" to the Corinthians "that which I also received, that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures?'*[42] *How could Christ rise at all, if he did not first die?*

10,7 *But those who even suppose that there can be "a quaternity instead of the Trinity" if the body is said to be from Mary, must blush beet red.* (8) *"For," < they say >, "if we say that the body is co-essential with the Word, the Trinity remains a Trinity, since the Word imports nothing foreign into it. But if we say that the body born of Mary is a human body, then, since the body by its nature is other than [the Word], and since the Word is in it, there will necessarily be a quaternity instead of a Trinity because of the addition of the body."* (11,1) *But they do not realize how they fall foul of themselves by saying this. For if they say that the body is not from Mary but is co-essential with the Word, it will be shown nonetheless that they, on their notion, are speaking of a quaternity—the very misrepresentation that they made to avoid giving the impression that they believed it.* (2) *For as the Son who, in their view, is not the Father himself despite his co-essentiality with the Father, but is called a*

[39] John 1:14.
[40] Gal 3:13.
[41] Joel 3:1.
[42] 1 Cor 15:3.

Son co-essential with the Father, so the body, which is co-essential with the Word, is not the Word himself, but different from the Word. (3) *But since it is different, on their own showing their Trinity will be a quaternity. For the true, and truly perfect and undivided Trinity receives no addition, but the Trinity of their invention does. And since they invent a God other than the true one, how can they still be Christians'?*

11,4 *For once more, their foolishness can be seen in another of their sophisms. They are very wrong if they think that a quaternity is being spoken of instead of a Trinity because the Savior's body is, and is said in the scriptures to be, of Mary and human, since this makes an addition to the Trinity because of the body. For they are equating the creature with the creator, and supposing that the Godhead can receive an addition.* (5) *And they have not understood that the Word did not become flesh to add to the Godhead, but to enable the flesh to rise—nor that the Word did not come forth from Mary for his own betterment, but for the redemption of the human race.*

11,6 *How can they think that the body, which was redeemed and given life by the Word, makes an addition of Godhead to the life-giving Word? Rather, a great addition was made to <the> human body itself by the Word's fellowship and union with it.* (7) *Instead of a mortal body it became immortal; instead of an ensouled body it became spiritual. Though a body of earth, it passed through the heavenly gates. The Trinity is a Trinity even though the Word took a body from Mary. It allows of no addition or subtraction but is forever perfect, and is known as one Godhead in Trinity; thus it is preached in the church that there is one God, the Father of the Word.*

12,1 *Because of this, finally, those who once said, "The one who came forth from Mary is not the Christ himself, and Lord and God," will hold their tongues.* (2) *If he was not God in the body, why was he called "Immanuel, which, being interpreted, is, God is with us,"*[43] *as soon as he came forth from Mary? And if the Word was not in flesh, why did Paul write to the Romans, "of whom, according to the flesh, Christ came, who is God over all, blessed for evermore. Amen?"*[44] (3) *Let those who formerly denied that the Crucified is God admit their error and be convinced by all the sacred scriptures—most of all by Thomas who, after seeing the nail prints in his hands, cried out, "My Lord and my God!"*[45]

[43] Matt 1:23.
[44] Rom 9:5.
[45] John 20:28.

12,4 *For though the Son was God and the Lord of glory, he was in the ingloriously nailed, dishonored body. The body suffered when it was pinned to the wood and blood and water flowed from its side, but all the while, as the temple of the Word, it was filled with the Word's Godhead.* (5) *Thus it was that the sun withdrew its rays and darkened the earth on seeing its maker lifted up in his tortured body. But though of a mortal nature, the body itself rose in transcendence of its nature. It ceased from the corruptibility of its nature, became the garment of the Word, and by donning the more than human Word, became incorruptible.*

12,6 *But there is no reason for me to discuss the imaginary thing some people say, "As a word came upon each of the prophets, so the Word came upon one particular man who was born of Mary." Their stupidity obviously carries its own condemnation. If this is the way he came, why is he born of a virgin, and not as the child of a man and a woman himself? Each of the saints was born like that.* (7) *Or, if this is how the Word came, why is every man's death not said to have been for us, but only the death of this man? If the Word arrived with each of the prophets, why is it said only of the son of Mary that he came "once, in the end of the ages?"*[46] (8) *Or, if he came in the same way that he came in the saints before him, why have all the others died and not yet risen, while the son of Mary alone arose the third day?* (9) *Or, if the Word came just like the others, why is only the son of Mary called Immanuel, because his body has been filled with Godhead and born of her? For Immanuel means "God is with us."* (10) *Or, if this is the way he came, since each of the saints eats, tires and dies, why is it not said that each one < was > eating, tiring and dying but said only of the Son of Mary? For the things this body suffered are mentioned because it was he himself who suffered them. And though of all the others it is said merely that they were born and begotten, only of Mary's offspring is it said, "And the Word was made flesh."*[47]

13,1 *This will show that the Word came to all the others to help them prophesy, but that the Word himself took flesh from Mary and came forth as a man—God's Word in nature and essence, "but of the seed of David according to the flesh"*[48]*—and was made man of Mary's flesh, as Paul has said.* (2) *The Father identified him in the Jordan and on the mount by saying "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."*[49] (3) *The Arians have*

---

[46] Heb 9:26.
[47] John 1:14.
[48] Rom 1:3.
[49] Matt 3:17; 17:5.

denied him but we know and worship him, not distinguishing the Son from the Word, but knowing that the Word himself is the Son, by whom all things have been made, and we set free.

13,4 *Thus I am surprised that there has been any contention among you over matters so < plain >. But God be thanked, my sorrow at reading your minutes is matched by my joy at their conclusion.* (5) *For [the participants] departed in harmony, and peaceably agreed on the confession of the orthodox faith. It is this that has led me to write these few lines after much prior consideration, for I am concerned that my silence not give pain rather than joy to those who, by their agreement, have given me cause to rejoice. I therefore ask that, primarily your Reverence, and secondly your hearers, receive this with a good conscience, and, if < in any respect > it falls short of true religion, that you correct this and send me word. But if it has been unfitly and imperfectly written as by one untrained in speaking, I ask the pardon of all for my feebleness of speech. Farewell!*

14,1 Since I have inserted this letter and not merely set out to write against the Apollinarians because of things I have heard from them or from others, it has been made plain to everyone that I have accused no one falsely. (2) But next I shall take up the case against them, so that there can be no suspicion on anyone's part that I am slandering my brethren—though I pray for them even now, that they may correct the things that appear to disturb me, so that they may not lose me, or I, them. (3) For I have often made this plea, and have begged, and still continue to beg that they remove the contention and follow the sacred ordinance of the apostles, the evangelists and the fathers, and the confession of the faith which is simple, firm, unshakeable, and in every way entirely right.

14,4 Others have told me in private that the Lord did not take this flesh of ours, or any flesh like it, when he came, but took another flesh, different from ours. And if they would only speak to his glory and praise! (5) I too say that his body is holy and undefiled: "He did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth."[50] And this is plain to everyone who speaks and thinks of Christ in a godly way. (6) And even though I speak of his actual body just as he took our actual body, < I still mean that* > his body < remained* > undefiled. In us who have offended, however, < our bodies have become different from the Lord's* >. [This is] not because our bodies are different, and alien to his in their inferiority and degradation; < our bodies have become different from the Lord's* > because of our sins

[50] 1 Pet 2:22.

and transgressions. (7) For the Lord did not take one sort of body while we have another sort; the very body which [in him] is preserved and kept undefiled, < in us has been sullied* >.

15,1 Others of them, even now motivated by contention, are led on by strange opinions and do not "hold fast to the head of the faith" as the fathers teach, "from whom the whole body, supplied and knit together by its joints and bands, increaseth with the increase of God,"[51] as the apostle says. (2) With their ears ringing, perhaps as with strange doctrines, they, like Valentinus, Marcion and Mani, imagine things in supposed honor of Christ rather than telling the truth.

15,3 Whenever I tell them that Christ had our body, they turn at once to their own contentious fabrications (4) and say that he had nails, flesh, hair and so on, but not the kind we have; he had different nails, different flesh, and all the rest not like what we have but different from ours. < They imagine their* > futile words because they would like to do Christ some sort of quibbling favor in their own turn, if you please, like Valentinus and the other sects I have mentioned. (5) For they say, "If we confess that Christ's < body > < has* > all [the features of a body] in their entirety,[52] <we must also allow it all the natural functions." But "Meddle not with more than thy works."* >[53] This scripture refers to people of their kind, who are "busybodies and work not."[54] (6) To strike terror in the hearts of the simple, they say straight off, "[If Christ's body was like ours], he had the normal physical needs—evacuation, or going to the bathroom, or the other things." They think all this is wise, but it is horrid and silly, as the prophet said, "Who hath required this at your hands?"[55] (7) Of which of the saints did scripture mention such things, although the prophets were men and not gods, and the evangelists and others were unquestionably made of soul and flesh like ourselves? Where did scripture not witness instead to the more seemly things in the saints, let alone the Lord Christ?

16,1 Those who are frightening the sheep, startling the doves and stampeding Christ's lambs and flock, had better tell me where Moses went to the bathroom during the forty days! (2) Where did Elijah attend to his needs at the brook Kidron (sic), when he ate bread in the morning and meat in the evening, brought by the ravens at God's command? (3) It

---

51 Cf. Col 2:19.
52 Here Holl adds two lines of Greek. MSS: simply περιέργως.
53 Sir 3:23.
54 2 Thes 3:11.
55 Isa 1:12.

would be foolish of the scripture to speak of these things, just as it was foolish of these people to inquire into them. What is the good of such things? What use are they—except to foster unbelief, since prejudice finds its opportunities in silly statement and worthless rebuttal.

16,4 What's more, better tell me why God kept the children of Israel's hair from getting long for forty years, and their shoes from wearing out, and their clothes from getting worn or torn, when that was his will. (5) Had they come from heaven too? Were they gods? Indeed, they were not in God's good graces, but had provoked God in many ways. Didn't they have the same frailties as we? God did this to show that in him all things are possible, and that he allows them to happen and not happen.

16,6 But for our sakes, lest anyone should attribute anything supernatural to them because of the miracles God did for them—that is, that their hair did not grow, and their clothes did not wear out and the rest, and because "Man ate the bread of angels"[56]—(7) the sacred scripture reassured us by saying, "Let each man take an iron peg in his girdle, that, when thou easest thyself in a place, thou shalt dig and cover thine own stool; for ye are people sanctified, and the Lord dwelleth in the midst of your camp."[57] (8) As to this, the native Hebrews tell the story that this was the standard for a while, until God willed to show this wonder in them, that even though they were eating both meat and land-rails,[58] they found they had no need of it.

17,1 And whether, < as seems more likely* >, the Hebrews have this tradition in their ancestors' honor, whether, < preferably >, as a gratuitous addition or as a fact—though they surely know themselves that their clients were mortal and not gods, and were made of flesh, blood and soul—(2) who can put up with the Apollinarians' insufferable remarks about Christ, the divine Word who came from heaven, and his in all respects glorious and true human nature? In it he fulfilled the saying, "in all points tempted as a man, yet without sin."[59] (3) For even though he truly had our flesh, it was possible for him not to do the things that we regard as undignified, and to do such things as were seemly, and of a fitness in proportion to his Godhead. For it was by his doing that the hair of the children of Israel did not grow, their clothes did not get dirty, and these things < which >, according to tradition, happened to them. (4) But there

[56] Ps 77:25.
[57] Deut 23:13–14.
[58] ὀρτυγομήτρα, a bird that migrates with quail.
[59] Cf. Heb 4:15.

is no doubt that Christ indeed had man-made clothing: "They parted his raiment, and upon his vesture did they cast lots."[60] (5) But if his garment was made by men it was plainly made of wool and linen, and woolen and linen things are inanimate and lifeless. (6) And yet when Christ willed to display the power of his Godhead "He was transfigured and showed his countenance as the sun, and his garments white as wool."[61] (7) "For to the Mighty One all things are possible,"[62] and in an instant he can change lifeless and inanimate things, contrary to expectation, to glory and splendor, like Moses' rod, like the shoes of the children of Israel. (8) For we all agree that the holy apostles were men, with mortal bodies like ours. But because of the glory of God that indwelt them they were immortal, and Peter's shadow healed all the sick who were brought to him, and napkins and kerchieves from Paul's clothing worked miracles.

18,1 And why do these people take the trouble to make shameful guesses about God, on subjects there has never been a need to discuss—for any prophet, evangelist, apostle or author? (2) However many of such things they say, even if they make a million more bad guesses, they won't overturn the faith of our fathers which declares Christ truly < man >.

18,3 For Christ was truly born in the flesh of Mary the ever-virgin, by the agency of the Holy Spirit. He was called Immanuel, or "God is with us," < and > can have no second birth. (4) As a child he fled to Egypt with Joseph and Mary, since [enemies] were seeking the child's life—which is as much as to say that he could be killed in the flesh. Still, he was worshiped by the magi as true God, begotten in the flesh < in reality >, not appearance. (5) And due to Joseph's fear because of Archelaus, he did not enter Jerusalem on his return from Egypt—showing that the child could be arrested, and could[63] suffer too soon what he was to suffer in the flesh.

18,6 < He came willingly to baptism* >, but was hindered by John, recognized as master by the servant as God truly incarnate. But in this case, so as to "fulfill all righteousness"[64] in the flesh and "leave us an example"[65]

---

[60] John 19:24.
[61] Matt 17:2.
[62] Cf. Mark 10:27.
[63] Drexl and MSS δυναμένου . . . ἐν σαρκὶ παθεῖν, Holl δυναμένου <ἀναγκασθῆναι> ἐν σαρκὶ παθεῖν.
[64] Matt 3:15.
[65] Cf. 1 Pet 2:21.

of salvation in his true and perfect humanity, he did not accept his servant's honor.

18,7 Moreover, he grew truly weary from his journey—and he was not simply weary but sat down as well, because he had truly become man. < And yet > he cried, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest,"[66] to show that his Godhead is sufficient to give rest to all the world's multitudes who come to him. (8) Further, he was tempted by the devil, and remained forty days without food or drink, to show the self-sufficiency of his Godhead. (9) For he did not go hungry as you and I master ourselves like philosophers, and subject himself to discipline and restraint; because of his true Godhead, he went hungry without lacking anything. (10) And the scripture says, "He was afterwards an hungered,"[67] to show the true incarnation of his Godhead, which allowed the manhood the satisfaction of its lawful and true needs, so that the truth of the sequence [of these events][68] would not hide the true manhood. (11) For he was hungry at the fig tree too, and he made real clay. But as God he commanded the fig tree and was obeyed. And on the ship he rebuked the wind, and it dropped. (12) And with the spittle and clay he fashioned the missing member and bestowed it on the blind man, as upon Adam, by the command of his Godhead and the spittle of his humanity—and once again, by the clay. For all things were in him in their fullness; suffering in his flesh, impassibility in his Godhead, until he arose from the dead, never again to suffer, to "die no more"[69] at all.

18,13 But if there are any who suppose that, because he did not get it from a man's seed, he received a different body, this in no way makes it unlike our bodies. Since we agree that it was born of Mary, it was ours. Mary was not different from our bodies—for Adam was not from a man's seed either, but was formed from earth! (14) And his body was by no means different from ours because of his being of the earth and not of a man's seed. For we are his descendants and our bodies are not different from his, even though we are of a man's seed and born of a woman's womb.

18,15 But by quibbling about this often and having it in their heads, some have lost touch with the question before us. In turn, some of those who come to see me have wasted a million other words and more on the

---

66 Matt 11:28.
67 Matt 4:2.
68 I.e., he fasts for forty days without needing food, and only then becomes hungry.
69 Rom 6:9.

accusation of a man who is widely esteemed. And in fact, I think they have made the disturbance worse than necessary, whether < unintentionally* > from stupidity or ignorance, or whether they deliberately come forward and speak out. But with the readers' agreement, let this be enough about the non-essentials; < I have not written* > from motives of envy, or dislike of the man. (16) For I pray that he has not been parted from the church of Christ and the sweetness of the whole brotherhood, but that he has given up instigating the contention over this matter and returned, as scripture says, "Return, return, O Shunamite; return, and we will look on thee."[70] In any case, I shall once more take up the thread of the subject.

19,1 He will not say that Christ's human nature is complete. Furthermore, he hinders some people's salvation by frightening them and telling them we must not say that Christ has "taken up" perfect manhood, supposedly because of the scripture, "The Lord taketh up the meek."[71] (2) But no one can show that this is anything out of the ordinary or different—to say that he Lord "took up" flesh, or "took" perfect manhood—from our frequent use of synonymous expressions. (3) Scripture says, 'The Lord taketh up the meek," "He took me up from the flocks of sheep,"[72] "He was taken up,"[73] and, "The two men said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye? This [Jesus], who hath been taken up from you."[74] (4) And there is no difference at all in the meaning of taking up, whether one says "Christ took up," or, "took," or, "formed his own humanity."[75] Nor can those who choose to attack the simple and < say that > we must < not > talk like this, frighten us with this word.

And no one need think that I am speaking slanderously, or jokingly, about this matter. (5) I have often thought of writing on this subject, but < have held back > so that no one would think I was attacking him from enmity. Humanly speaking, he has done me no harm, and taken nothing of mine. (6) But though I considered not writing this, I am compelled to by the truth itself, so as to omit no < one > whose opinions are different from the faith, as pious readers will understand later that I am not speaking from worldly jealousy. (7) Indeed, the man would be of the utmost service to me—< he is the best* > in the world, both in < education* > and

---

[70] Cant 7:1.
[71] Ps 146:6.
[72] Cf. Ps 77:70.
[73] Acts 1:2.
[74] Acts 1:11.
[75] ἀνέλαβεν, ἔλαβεν, ἀνεπλάσσατο.

in love—if, in harmony with God's holy church, he would agree with us all in every way and not import any strange doctrine.

19,8 Whether he or his disciples use the expression in passing, in a different sense [but] in this form and appearance, I cannot say. (9) But I have often considered, and been perturbed that they justify the arousal of contention and a battle to the death for the sake of this expression. (10) And this tells me that they probably use the expression in some rather strange sense.

20,1 For when you ask any of them they all tell you something different, but some say that the Lord has not taken perfect manhood or become perfect man. (2) But since many found this repugnant they finally turned to deception, as I learned directly from them in so many words. (3) For I visited Antioch and had a meeting with their leaders, one of whom was the bishop Vitalius, a man of the most godly life, character and conduct. (4) And I advised and urged them to assent to the faith of the holy church, and give up the contentious doctrine.

20,5 But Vitalius said, "But what quarrel is there between us?" For he was at odds with a respectable and eminent man, the bishop Paulinus, and Paulinus was at odds with Vitalius, whom I had summoned. (6) I hoped to reconcile the two; both appeared to be preaching the orthodox faith, and yet each of them disagreed [with the other] for some reason—(7) for Vitalius had accused Paulinus of Sabellianism. And thus, when I arrived < at Antioch* > I had refrained from full communion with Paulinus, until he convinced me by submitting a document < in > which, on a previous occasion, he had stated his agreement with the blessed Athanasius to clear himself. (8) For he brought a signed copy of this and gave it to me. It contains a clear statement about the Trinity and the mind of Christ's human nature, composed by our blessed father Athanasius himself. I append this statement; it is as follows:

A copy of the document written by Bishop Paulinus[76]

21,1 *I, Paulinus, bishop, believe as I have received from the fathers that there is a perfect existent and subsistent Father and a perfect subsistent Son, and that the perfect Holy Spirit is subsistent.* (2) *I therefore receive the above account of the three entities and the one subsistence or essence, and receive*

[76] This document is also appended to the Epistle of the Council of Alexandria, 362 A.D., as given in Athanasius, Tomus ad Alexandras 11.

those who so believe; for it is godly to believe and confess the Trinity in one Godhead. (3) *And of the incarnation for us of the Word of the Father, I believe as it has formerly been written that, as John says, "The Word was made flesh."*[77] (4) *For I do not believe as the most impious persons do, who say that he has undergone a change; but I believe that he has become man for us, and was conceived of the holy Virgin and the Holy Spirit.*

21,5 *Nor did the Savior have a lifeless body without sensation or intelligence.* (6) *For as the Lord has become man for us, it would be impossible that his body be without intelligence.* (7) *I therefore condemn those who set aside the creed of Nicaea, and do not confess that the Son is of the Father's essence, or co-essential with the Father.* (8) *I also condemn those who say that the Holy Spirit is a creature made by the Son.* (9) *I further condemn the heresies of Sabellius and Photinus, and every heresy, for I am content with the creed of Nicaea and with all that is written above.*

The End

22,1 But I said besides to my brother Vitalius and those who were with him, "And what do you have to say? If there is anything wrong between you, put it right!"

"Let them tell you < themselves >," said Vitalius. (2) But Paulinus and his companions said that Vitalius and his denied that Christ has become perfect man.

Vitalius answered at once, "Yes, we confess that Christ has taken perfect manhood." And this was wonderful for the audience to hear, and a great pleasure. (3) < But > since I know the spirit of those who gain their brothers' agreement through pretenses, I kept asking for his exact meaning, and said, "Do you confess that Christ has truly taken flesh?"

"Yes," he agreed.

22,4 "Of the holy virgin Mary and by the Holy Spirit, without the seed of a man?" He agreed to this too.

22,5 "Did the divine Word, the Son of God, actually take flesh from the Virgin at his coming?" He emphatically agreed.

By this time I had become glad, for I had heard from some of those youngsters who came to me on Cyprus that he did not believe that Christ's flesh was from Mary at all. (6) But when this most godly man himself had confessed that our Lord Jesus Christ took flesh from Mary, I asked him, in turn, if he also took a soul. To this too he agreed with the same vehe-

[77] John 1:14.

mence, and said, "One must not say otherwise, but must tell the truth in everything. (7) For whoever writes to men about the truth must disclose his whole mind, have the fear of God before his eyes, and include no falsehood in the message of the scripture."

23,1 Vitalius, then, agreed that Christ had also taken a human soul; for it was he who had said, "Yes, Christ was perfect man." But next, after my questions about the soul and the flesh, I asked, "Did Christ take a mind when he came?"

Vitalius at once denied this and said, "No."

23,2 Then I said to him, "Then why do you say that he has been made perfect man?" And he revealed his own notion of the meaning of this: "We are calling him perfect man if we make him the Godhead instead of the mind, and the flesh and the soul, so that he is perfect man composed of flesh, and soul, and Godhead instead of mind."

23,3 So now his contentiousness was out in the open and I discussed it at length, and proved from scripture that we must confess that the divine Word took everything in its perfection, that he provided < the human nature > in its fullness at his incarnation and < possesses > it in its fullness; and that he united it [with his Godhead] after his resurrection and possesses it, and none other, in glory, in its entirety and spiritual, united in his Godhead with himself; and that the whole fullness makes one Godhead, and he sits at the Father's right hand in heaven, on the glorious throne of his eternal sovereignty and rule. But in the end I got up without having convinced either side, because of their obvious contentiousness.

23,4 But this is how I realized that they were not talking about the mind, but that their doctrine of the mind is different [from ours]. For at times they would not admit that Christ had taken a soul. (5) But when I made the rejoinder, "Well, what is the 'mind' then? Do you think it's a real thing inside a man? Is man therefore a conglomerate?" some of them opined that the "mind" is the "spirit" which the sacred scripture regularly says is in man. (6) But when I showed them that the mind is not the spirit, since the apostle plainly says, "I will sing with the mind, I will sing with the spirit,"[78] there was a long discussion, but I could not convince the contending parties.

24,1 Then in turn, I asked some of them, "What do you mean? Are you saying that the mind is an actual thing?" And some of them said it is not a thing, because I had convinced them with, "I will sing with the mind,

[78] 1 Cor 14:15.

I will sing with the spirit," that we must not believe that the mind is the thing called "the spirit of a man." (2) And since they had no reply to this, I then said, "All right, if the mind isn't a real thing but is a movement of our whole selves, but you say of this that Christ is the mind, do you therefore imagine that Christ isn't a real thing, and that he has brought his incarnation about only nominally, and in appearance?"

24,3 And I felt deeply grieved[79] then, and the even tenor of my life was made painful, because dissensions had been sown for no good reason among these people who are brethren and praiseworthy, so that that enemy of man, the devil, may keep causing differences among us. (4) But, brethren, considerable mutual damage arises from this cause. It would be simplest if no discussion of this had been stirred up in the first place. What good has this innovation done the world? How has it benefited the church—or rather, hasn't it harmed it by causing hatred and strife? But because this doctrine has been put forward, it has become frightening. (5) It is not for the betterment of our salvation; it is a denial of our salvation, not only on this point for one who does not confess it, but in a very small point too.[80] One must not stray from the way of the truth even in an unimportant matter.

24,6 Let me speak against this doctrine too, then, since I choose not to stray from my own salvation or abandon the rule of God's holy church and confession. (7) None of the ancients ever said this—no prophet, apostle, evangelist, no interpreter down to our own day, when this doctrine of such sophistry issued from the very learned man I have spoken of. (8) For he has been equipped with no mean education. He began with elementary schooling and Greek learning, and was trained in the whole of dialectic and rhetoric. Moreover, his life is otherwise of the holiest, and he remained beloved by the orthodox[81] < and > ranked with the foremost, until this business. (9) He suffered banishment too, because he < would > not associate with the Arians. And why should I say all this? I am very sorry, and my life is a grief to me because, as I have often said, the devil is always afflicting us.

25,1 Now then, to omit none of the truth, as I have said, I shall begin on this doctrine. What good has it done us to expel the mind from Christ's

---

[79] Holl λύπη καὶ ὀδυνηρά ; MSS: λυπηρά.

[80] I.e., not only is the Apollinarian doctrine of Christ heretical, but they have an unscriptural definition of "mind."

[81] Holl <ὅς καὶ πρὸς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων ἀεὶ ἐν ἀγάπῃ/ καὶ ἐν πρώτῳ ἀριθμῷ/ τε ταττόμενος; MSS καὶ τῶν πρὸς ὀρθοδόξων ἀεὶ ἐν πρώτῳ ἀριθμῷ/ ταττόμενος.

human nature? (2) If your argument was advanced to be a help—if I can say that—to our Lord Jesus Christ, the divine Word and the Son of God, and we are to deny that he took a mind so as not to conceive of any defect in his Godhead, the Manichaeans, the Marcionites and other sects deserve much more credit than we. They will not ascribe flesh to him, so as not to make his Godhead defective.

25,3 But the meaning of the truth does not conform to human wishes, but to the wisdom that governs it, and the incomprehensibility that directs it. (4) Since we profess our faith in this form and do not agree with Mani—he will do Christ no favor by supposing that Christ has not taken flesh, but will be deprived of the truth by confessing Christ's incarnation [only] in appearance. [Since we do not agree with him], even now this vulgar chatter will be a favor of no use to our brothers. (5) Both they and we agree < that* >, unless they are willing to change their minds, < the Manichaeans will depart from our confession of faith entirely.* > And when pressed, certain Apollinarians have often been caught in the denial that Christ took true flesh, as I said, because some of them have dared to say that his flesh is co-essential with his Godhead. (6) But they should be cast out as < un >repentant, and exposed for such wickedness before those of them whose view of Christ's flesh is correct. Surely the most godly Apollinarius himself will not deny this.

26,1 Now if the Word took true flesh when he came, and truly took it from Mary, not by a man's seed but through the Holy Spirit; and if he was truly conceived and, since he was God and the fashioner of the first man and all things, fashioned his own < flesh >; then the Word was not diminished at his coming, but remained in his own unchanging nature. (2) For since he is co-essential with God the Father and not different from the Father and the Holy Spirit, he underwent no change when he took flesh. If we agree, therefore, that he has plainly taken flesh and come to maturity, then he is not without a soul. (3) For except for things which do not move, everything that matures is composed of soul and body, as the scripture says, "Jesus increased in wisdom and maturity," to prove his flesh by the "maturity";[82] but maturity, as I said, is attained by a soul and a body.

26,4 But after saying, "He increased in maturity," it next says, "and in wisdom." And how could he who is the Father's wisdom increase in wisdom, if his body was deprived of a human mind? And if he was without

[82] Luke 2:52.

mind, how could he increase in wisdom, soul and body? And you see how forced people's notion is when they reject the mind.

"But," Apollinarius would say, "I deny that he took a human mind. [If we say that he did], we will make him covetous, ill-tempered; for the mind in us is covetous." And there certainly is a great deal of human contention; as the scripture has said, "God made man simple, but they have made for themselves many counsels."[83] (5) Now if, by the confession that he has taken a human mind, we attribute any of our defectiveness to him, all the more, by confessing that he has taken flesh, we will grant on the same principle that he has become defective in this respect, in flesh. But perish that thought! (6) Now as the Word was < not > defective in the flesh when he came even though he had true flesh, so he has not conceived of anything unbecoming his Godhead in his mind. The Lord, when he came, did whatever is right for flesh, and for a soul and a human mind, so as not to disturb the course of his true human life. (7) For hunger, thirst, weariness, sleep, journeying, grief, weeping and disturbance were right. But these right things duly taking place in him showed < the truth* > of his true human nature.

27,1 For scripture never says that he had a wrong desire. But he had a good desire when he said, "With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you."[84] Desire, however, does not stem from his Godhead, or from the flesh alone or the irrational soul, but from the perfect manhood of body, < soul and > mind, and everything in man. (2) For the Word acquired these things when he came—body, soul, mind and all that is in man, except for sin, except for defect, as the scripture says, "in all points tempted as a man except for sin."[85] But if he was tempted in *all* points, the Word acquired *all* things when he came. (3) If he had acquired everything, however, then in himself he was free from defect and kept them all unsullied—being perfect God born of flesh, and, as the Perfecter of the whole human nature, perfectly fulfilling all things. He was not divided by the unseemly behavior of the flesh, or distracted by the wrong thought of the mind within us.

27,4 For our mind was not given us to sin, but to examine the ends of our ideas from both sides and perform righteousness and the opposite. "The mind discriminates words; the throat tastes foods,"[86] and, "Eye

[83] Cf. Eccles 7:29.
[84] Luke 22:15.
[85] Cf. Heb 4:15.
[86] Job 12:11.

understands and mind sees."[87] Thus the mind is the sight, taste and discrimination within us and is granted us by God, but assents to nothing unless the man wants it to. (5) But the flesh is continually denounced in every scripture for the lust that arises in it. Of course the text is not denouncing flesh itself; the word denounced the products of the flesh, as the apostle said because of the flesh's by-products, "I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing."[88]

27,6 But in rejection of the sects' idea that the flesh has nothing to hope for from the resurrection of the dead, Paul says, "This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality."[89] Thus it may not be thought that, by rejecting the works of flesh which scripture regularly calls "flesh," he is rejecting the hope of the resurrection of the flesh. (7) For he plainly denounced the deeds that are wickedly done in the flesh, but showed that, in a person who sanctifies his flesh, the flesh itself is a holy temple, as the scripture says, "Pure worship of God and our Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world,"[90] and elsewhere, "Blessed are they that keep pure the flesh."[91]

27,8 But though the scripture has often spoken against "flesh" and taught us that lusts and pleasures grow in it, it makes no complaint against the mind. Instead it says, "I will sing with the mind, I will sing with the spirit,"[92] and, "if, in turn, I sing with the spirit, but my mind is unfruitful."[93] (9) And you see that there is fruit in him, in his mind. And even if there were no fruit, Paul never counted the mind as sinful, but made the fruit known by means of the mind.

28,1 But what harm did this do to the power of our Lord's Godhead? What weakened his power? The holy woman's belly? The Virgin's womb? His parents' journeys? Simeon's embrace? Anna's welcome? Being carried by Mary? The harlot's touch? A woman's hair touching his feet? Her tears? Being laid in a tomb? The shroud did not envelop that inviolate Lord and his supreme power by enwrapping his body.

---

87 Cf. Prov 20:12.
88 Rom 7:18.
89 1 Cor 15:53.
90 Cf. Jas 1:27.
91 Acts of Paul and Thecla 5.
92 1 Cor 14:15.
93 Cf. 1 Cor 14:14.

28,2 Indeed, when he was still in the womb John leaped for joy at his Master's visit to him through the holy Virgin's pregnancy. But when he had been born and lay in a manger, it was no mystery to a choir of angels. Bands of angels were sent to serve as escorts at the coming of the everlasting king; hymns of victory were offered, peace was proclaimed to the shepherds.

28,3 But what caused any weakening of his power? While he was still a babe in arms a sign, the star, appeared in the east, magi arrived, worship was offered and gifts given. Scribes were questioned by the king, and in reply they confessed their faith in Christ. (4) And all the other things in the series, what harm did they do his Godhead? How did the possession of the flesh veil it, as is the case with us? He rebuked the waves, winds and sea, and the power of his Godhead was not prevented by the flesh from doing what it is the Godhead's nature to do. (5) What is more, though the flesh is a burden and load, he was not encumbered by a load. As the changeless God, and in the flesh but not changed by the flesh, he walked on the water < as though on dry land >. With a < loud > voice he called, "Lazarus, come forth!"[94] unhindered by the flesh, and with no enslavement of his Godhead in the flesh to his perfect manhood.

29,1 And I have a great deal to say < about this >. He rose from the dead, what is more, forced the gates of hades, took the captives, brought them upward; and after rising the third day in his holy flesh itself, and in his holy soul, mind and entire human nature, he became perfect man united with Godhead, for he had joined his manhood to his Godhead, and death "hath no more dominion over him.[95] (2) United with his Godhead, however, he made his coarseness fine and "entered where doors were barred."[96] And after his entrance he exhibited his "flesh and bones,"[97] suggesting the readiness of his power to save, and affording us a glimpse of our hope, for the Word has perfected all things by his coming. And he sat in glory at the Father's right hand after being taken up in his body itself, not burdened by its bulk [and yet] not without a body, for he had raised his body spiritual. (3) If our body is "sown in corruption, raised in incorruption, sown a natural body, raised a spiritual body,"[98] how much more the body of God's only-begotten Son? And thus the scripture, "Thou

[94] John 11:43.
[95] Rom 6:9.
[96] Cf. John 20:19; 26.
[97] Luke 24:39.
[98] Cf. 1 Cor 15:42–44.

shalt not deliver thine holy one to see corruption, neither shalt thou leave my soul in hell,"[99] has been fulfilled.

29,4 But I have said all this about his perfect human nature so that no one will suppose that, because he took perfect flesh, he therefore did the unsuitable deeds of the flesh. No orthodox believer thinks or says this of him. But if no one thinks that he did the unsuitable deeds of the flesh, no one may suppose that he did the unsuitable deeds of the mind! (5) And it is plain that, when he came, the Word became man perfectly.

And if we say, "[became man] perfectly," we do not have two Christs, or two kings and sons of God, but the same God and the same Man—not as though he had come to dwell in a man, but the same God himself wholly made man. And not a man who advanced to Godhead but God come from heaven, who modeled his own manhood on himself in keeping with his mighty Godhead, as scripture says, "The Word became flesh."[100]

29,6 But as to "The Word became flesh," to avoid giving the impression that he was man first, and Christ came to a man, the holy Gospel put "Word" first, and then confessed the flesh with, "The Word was made flesh." (7) For it did not say, "The flesh was made Word." This shows that the Word came from heaven first, formed his own flesh from the holy Virgin's womb, and perfectly fashioned his entire human nature in his image. (8) For even if scripture says, "The Word was made flesh," this is not because the Word was turned into flesh and the Word became flesh [in this way], or because the Godhead was transformed into flesh; at his coming, with his Godhead, the divine Word took his own humanity.

30,1 And scripture says that "Jesus increased in maturity and wisdom."[101] How could he "increase" [in wisdom] without a human mind?—I have said this already. And God's holy prophet Isaiah also witnesses to this text by saying, "Behold, my beloved servant in whom I am well pleased shall understand."[102] (2) And do you see that "shall understand" refers to a perfect human nature? Without a mind, no one can "understand"; and the text does not apply to Godhead. For that which is understanding itself cannot be in need of understanding, and that which is Wisdom itself cannot be in need of wisdom; "He shall understand" is to be taken of the human mind.

---

99 Cf. Ps 15:10.
100 John 1:14.
101 Luke 2:52.
102 Cf. Isa 42:1.

30,3 And tell me, why was he hungry? If he was just flesh, how could he pay any attention to hunger? And if he was made only of body and soul, and his soul did not have the rationality of the mind which is the thought of the human nature—I don't mean wicked thought, but thought directed towards lawful need which is appropriate to his Godhead—then how could he be hungry or have a conception of hunger? (4) Tell me, how could he be grieved, if his soul was without a mind and reason? If a soul is irrational or if there is flesh without soul, it is not subject to grief or sorrow. (5) And I can think of many < replies* > which I should make to him. < For we must* > realize that quibbles are not to the point and that, if anything, they alarm those who want to think too far, and not measure themselves by the measure the most holy apostle recommended to us, "not to think more highly than we ought to think."[103]

31,1 They also confront us with certain words of scripture, "We have the mind of Christ,"[104] and say, "Do you see that the mind of Christ is different from our minds?" How simple people are! Each one leans in the direction he wants to go, and where he appears to be clever, turns out to be inept. (2) For though I am "inept in speech—but not in knowledge,"[105] as the scripture says—and though I am very limited, and I admire these people even when they attack the mind because of words, I am baffled by their notion because they interpret this text as proof of what is simply such sterile contentiousness on their part. For the thing (i.e., 2 Cor. 11:16) has no meaning with any bearing on this position.

31,3 For Paul says, "We have the mind of Christ."[106] But we need to ask what "Christ" means to them, or what the "mind of Christ" is. And here they show that they understand Christ as one thing, and his divine nature as something else. (4) For if they suppose that Christ [himself] replaces the [human] mind, and yet call only Christ's human nature "Christ," they are trying to lead me into one more dispute. And plainly, it is < not > [only] after the incarnation that he is described as the divine Word and Son of God. (5) < But > though the texts about him that call him Christ came earlier, even before the incarnation, it is in the incarnation that they are

---

[103] Rom 12:3.

[104] 1 Cor 2:16. At Leontius Adversus Fraudes Apollinistarum 141 (Lietzmann Fr. 155, p. 249) Timotheus is represented as quoting Apollinarius: "Christ is a living God-animated body and divine spirit in flesh, a heavenly mind of which we are all partakers as it is said, "We have the mind of Christ." With this, however, cf. 34,3–4.

[105] 2 Cor 11:6.

[106] 1 Cor 2:16.

fulfilled. For his Godhead does not lack the name of Christ, and his incarnation and human nature cannot be mentioned without such a name, as the scripture says, "Say not in thine heart, who shall ascend into heaven, that is, to bring Christ down. Or who shall descend into the deep, that is, to bring Christ up from the dead."[107]

31,6 And the apostle, in turn, says, "that they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."[108] Now "Thou hast sent" means "[sent] from on high"; and yet it cannot be separated from the words of Peter, "Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved among you by signs and wonders, whom God hath anointed with the Holy Spirit,"[109] and texts of this sort.

32,1 And next, in their desire to confront me with ideas that are in every way contentious, my very beloved brethren also preach, not without daring, that his divine nature has suffered, because of the text which says, "If they had known, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory."[110] (2) But some of Apollinarius' disciples, who, I suppose, do not understand this, want to invent something else by putting this forward with the rest. I would be surprised if Apollinarius himself says anything of the kind.

For it is no surprise if the sacred scripture says that the Lord of glory has been crucified. (3) We confess that his human nature too is the Lord of glory. The humanity is not separate from the Godhead, if we understand each of them properly and see the whole in combination as one person and one perfection. (4) For we preach and believe that Christ can suffer [but] not that he (i.e., the human nature) suffered for himself, or that the Sufferer and the Lord are different persons, or that the Godhead suffered. Our Lord Jesus Christ suffered while his Godhead remained unaltered and impassible and yet, while remaining impassible, suffered in the flesh. (5) For if Christ died for us—and truly died—his divine nature did not die. He died in the flesh—as the scripture says, "He was put to death in the flesh but quickened by the Spirit,"[111] and again, "Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh."[112]

---

[107] Rom 10:6–7.
[108] John 17:3.
[109] Acts 2:22.
[110] 1 Cor 2:8. At Antirrheticus 24, p. 179 (Apollinarius Fragment 48, Lietzmann p. 215) Gregory of Nyssa quotes Apollinarius as saying that Christ is called "Lord of glory" because he is an "incarnate mind . . . who did not become flesh in the Virgin but passed through her in transit and was before the ages."
[111] 1 Pet 3:18.
[112] 1 Pet 4:1.

32,6 It is remarkable that we confess that he truly suffered and yet is truly impassible. For because of its changelessness, impassibility and co-essentiality with the Father, his divine nature did not suffer; his flesh suffered, and yet the divine nature was not separate from the human nature in its suffering. (7) For the divine and the human nature were together when Christ suffered in his flesh on the cross yet remained impassible in his divine nature, so that we are no longer justified only in his flesh but also in his Godhead, and our salvation is effected in both ways, in the divine nature and in the flesh.

32,8 For Christ was no mere man for us, but a subsistent divine Word < become > incarnate, and God truly made man for us. Thus our hope is not in man but in the Godhead; and our God is not a God who suffers, but an impassible God. Still, he has not wrought our salvation without suffering, but by dying for us and offering himself to the Father as a sacrifice for our souls, "cleansing us with his blood,"[113] "tearing up the handwriting against us and nailing it to the cross,"[114] as the scripture everywhere teaches us.

33,1 And if the need arises, I shall have a great deal to say in proof of this. Elsewhere, in explaining this view of our sure salvation, I have said that if a garment is stained by a flow of blood, the blood has not stained the body of the wearer, but the stain on the garment is not considered the garment's, but the wearer's. (2) In the same way the passion did the divine nature no harm but was suffered in the human nature, and yet not only as the human nature's; otherwise the scripture, "Cursed be everyone whose hope is in man"[115] might be applicable to the work of salvation. It was also counted as the Godhead's though the Godhead does not suffer, so that the salvation of the passion might be credited to God's holy church in the Godhead.

33,3 And again, no pedant need wish to debate anything but the point of the comparison. Not every parable in the scripture is to be taken wholesale. For example, 'Judah is a lion's whelp"[116] is said because the animal is the strongest and kingliest, not because it is irrational and a predator. (4) So with the garment. It is not put on and taken off; "He put on majesty" once, as the scripture says, but the second time "He put it on,

[113] Heb 9:22.
[114] Col 2:14.
[115] Jer 17:5.
[116] Gen 49:9.

and was girded with strength,"[117] in fulfillment of the most holy apostle's words, "Christ dieth no more, death hath no more dominion over him."[118]

33,5 But in spite of this my brethren would like to cite "We have the mind of Christ"[119] to prove their point to me. However, going by what they say in explanation of the subject, they lead me to suspect that they may have understood "mind" [in the text] as something different from "Christ." (6) Yet if they do not think that the Godhead is separate from the humanity but that there is [only] one person, what further thing will this so-called "mind of Christ" be? Is the divine Word all by itself in the human nature, and without a human mind, as they say? Does [the divine] Christ have a "mind" other than the nature of his Godhead? Or is every difficult word used loosely, as proof of what goes on within us?

34,1 In fact every godly person lives, not in accordance with the mind of man, but in accordance with the "mind of Christ." He is filled by Christ in understanding, thinks righteously like Christ, lives in Christ by the confession [of him], is preserved in well-doing for Christ's sake. For this is the "mind of Christ," which is capable of being in us without confining Christ in an enclosure. (2) The Father, the Son and < the > Holy Spirit are everywhere, and Christ is in us spiritually if we become worthy of him, since no space encloses him, his Father and his Holy Spirit. By the power of his Godhead he is in all things, and yet is intermingled with nothing, because of his incommunicable and incomparable essence, and pure and infinite Godhead.

34,3 But when the apostle said, "We have the mind of Christ,"[120] what should we think he means? Did Paul have his own human < mind >? Or did he become filled with Christ's mind and lose his own, but have the mind of Christ instead of his own? Hardly! Each of his hearers would agree that he had his own mind but that he was filled with Christ's, who had equipped him with piety, knowledge, and God's heavenly way of life.

34,4 If, therefore, he was filled with Christ's mind while having his own, this means that, if we have to say it, Christ himself, the Word, was "mind"—for some have seen fit to call God "mind." (5) I, though, do not regard our mind as an entity—nor does any son of the church—but as a form of activity which God has bestowed upon us, and which is in us. But I do call Christ an entity, as all the faithful confess that he is; and

---

[117] Ps 92:1.
[118] Rom 6:9.
[119] 1 Cor 2:16.
[120] 1 Cor 2:16.

I confess that he is God and truly the Lord, begotten of the Father, Perfect of Perfect, Light of Light, and God of God. (6) But still, going by the same text, He who is mind in himself—as the holy apostle's teaching about him is "We have the mind of Christ"—had his own mind. And they to whom Paul testified had their own minds, and in turn were filled with the Mind, Christ, since his grace is capable of coming to fruition in them in this way.

35,1 Hence, on the exact analogy, it will make no difference if we assume this of Christ as well. For surely, even though Christ, who is mind in himself, shared the human mind as he shared flesh and blood and had the human soul, he was not the prisoner of the [human] mind. (2) For if the apostle who had the human mind as his own by nature, and the mind [of Christ] by participation in the gift, benefit and grace, no longer lived in accordance with his own mind but was directed, by a guidance transcending nature, by the mind of Christ, how much more the divine Word! He possessed all perfection in himself and was absolute perfection, absolute God, absolute power, absolute light, and the Completer, or rather, Perfecter, both of the mind and of the whole body, and wrought our salvation in all things by his advent in the flesh.

35,3 We must reject this text, then, as having no significance for this subject, and put aside the denial that all things, apart from sin, are complete in Christ. For the Word truly did all things at his coming, and brought the scriptural prophecies of himself to fulfillment—as the scripture says, "Behold, the Virgin shall conceive,"[121] and so on. He was conceived truly and not in appearance, was truly engendered in a womb. He truly lived in the flesh with flesh, true soul and true mind, and all true human characteristics except for sin. (4) He was truly born of a virgin womb—and truly of a holy virgin, not by the seed of men—with true flesh and soul and, as I said, a true mind. He was truly with his parents on their journey, truly lay in a manger in swaddling clothes, was borne in Mary's arms, went down to Egypt and was brought back from Egypt and returned to Nazareth, (5) went to the Jordan and was baptized by John and tempted by the devil. He truly chose disciples and preached the kingdom of heaven, just as everything about him is true—his betrayal by Judas and arrest by Jews, being brought to Pontius Pilate and condemned to death by him, his crucifixion and saying, "I thirst, give me to drink."[122] He truly

[121] Isa 7:14.
[122] Cf. John 19:28.

accepted vinegar with gall, tasted it, and accepted nothing else to drink. He was truly nailed to the cross and cried, "Eli, Eli, lema sabachthani."[123] He truly bowed his head and expired. His body was truly removed and taken away, truly wrapped in a shroud by Joseph and laid in a tomb, truly secured with a stone.

35,6 He descended to hades in his Godhead with his soul, bravely and mightily freed the prisoners, truly ascended the third day, the divine Word with his holy soul, with the captives he had rescued; he was truly raised with body, soul and all his human nature. He spent the forty days with his disciples, truly blessed them on the Mount of Olives, and truly ascended into heaven while his disciples watched him truly taken up to the clouds.

He took his seat and truly sits at the Father's right hand in his body itself and his Godhead, in his perfect human nature itself, (7) in which he has united the whole in one, and as a single spiritual perfection—seated in glory as God, who will truly come to judge the quick and the dead. And nothing has been altered; all perfect things have been perfectly done in him, in their perfection.

36,1 I believe that this will do for these questions, and judge that now is the time to drop the subject. But again, I must also give some indication of the nonsense I have been told < by > those who say such things. I cannot believe that this is what they say, but I still shall not leave out what I have been told. (2) For some have even dared to report that certain of them, in their turn, say that Mary had relations with her husband Joseph after Jesus' birth. But I would be surprised if even they say this. (3) There are people who do, and I have counted them as other schismatics, and by request have written a letter to certain persons in Arabia against the people who say this. (4) But I have said a great deal about this in treating of them in that letter. With God's help I shall add it next, in a chapter of its own.

36,5 Others have reported the venerable man as saying that we will live for a thousand years in the first resurrection, doing the same things we do now—observing the Law and the other ordinances, for example, engaging in all the activities of daily life, and taking part in marriage, circumcision and the rest. I simply can't believe this of him, but some have reported him as having said this, and insisted on it.

[123] Matt 17:46.

36,6 And it is plain that this millennium has been described in John's Revelation, and that the book has been believed by the majority, and the orthodox. But when the majority and orthodox read the book they know about the spiritual meanings, and take its spiritual statements as true < in the spiritual sense >, and believe that they must be given a profound explanation. For this is not the only profound utterance in Revelation; there are many others besides.

37,1 But for brevity's sake I merely mention the matter for now, to show the godly that, whenever one wants to overstep the bounds of God's holy church and the apostles' faith and teaching < which determine Christians'* > hope, his mind will finally be turned, by the brief, quick mention in passing of the one subject in his momentary, chance thought, (2) to many pieces of nonsense and shaky speculations—unsuitable and strange disputes, and, as the apostle has said, "endless genealogies."[124] (3) Anyone with sense can see that this is a very simple matter requiring no explanation; this sort of wisdom and subject for argument needs no investigation. (4) If we are raised to be circumcised again, why haven't we been circumcised before? In this regard, then, the ancients managed < to do > something more important than we, since they realized what perfection is, and were perfected in advance with what will be perfection then.

37,5 What becomes of the words of the apostle, "If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing,"[125] and, "All ye that are justified by the Law are fallen from grace?"[126] What about the Lord's words, "For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are equal unto the angels?"[127] (6) On the other hand, "Ye shall sit at the table < of the kingdom > of my Father eating and drinking,"[128] and, "when I drink it new with you in the kingdom of heaven,"[129] with the additional word, "new," and the phrase, "at the table of the kingdom," mean something different. (7) I myself agree with this, since I have learned from the sacred scriptures that there is a partaking of immortal food and drink. Of these it is said, "Eye hath not seen and ear hath not heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, what things God hath prepared for them that love him."[130]

---

124 1 Tim 1:4.
125 Gal 5:2.
126 Gal 5:4.
127 Luke 20:35–36.
128 Luke 22:30.
129 Mark 14:25.
130 1 Cor 2:9.

38,1 Apollinarius though, says that we partake of the material pleasures first, in the millennium, without labor and grief, but that after the millennium we partake of the things of which "eye hath not seen and ear hath not heard" was said.[131] (2) But this is contrary to the whole view of scripture. For if "The Law made no one perfect,"[132] but we are commanded to observe the Law after our resurrection, [this is a contradiction].[133] And if the "holy Law"[134] which was given by the Lord through Moses "was our conductor to Christ"[135] because of its inferiority to the things which are perfected,[136] (3) but < is abolished > because Christ, the Perfect and the Lord, has come and received the holy bride and church from the conductor of its tutees, that is, of the faithful—and if we have recognized "Jesus," the greater and the "Finisher,"[137] through the conductor's Law—how can their argument prove to be anything but a sign of shallow thinking and silliness, when they say such things as that (4) a conductor is needed again after the perfection of Christ, so that we may return to the "beginning" "of the rudiments"[138] and the teaching, and of "the laying on of hands,"[139] as the scripture says. But the apostle tells us plainly, as though < he meant > the Old Testament and the Law, that "That which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away."[140]

38,5 For he says, "The priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the Law."[141] But if the Old Testament has been changed and the New renewed, who can have the audacity to bring the Old back into use and the relegate the New to obsolescence, thereby preparing us to "fall from grace,"[142] and attempting to turn us away from the "profit"[143] of Christ?

38,6 But I have made these distinctions verbally in short compass, in the belief that this, again, is enough. Because of the extensiveness of the

---

131 This teaching is attributed to Apollinarius at Basil Ep. 265,2; Greg. Naz. Ep. 102.12; Carmen Hist. I De Se Ipso 30; 179; Jer. Com. In Isa. XVIII, Prefatio.

132 Heb 7:19.

133 This insertion, and the one below, are devices used to divide an otherwise unmanageably long sentence. Holl tentatively suggests < πῶς σταθήσεται τοῦτο > at this point.

134 Rom 7:12.

135 Gal 3:24.

136 Cf. Heb 9:11.

137 Heb 12:2.

138 Heb 5:12.

139 Heb 8:1.

140 Heb 8:13.

141 Heb 7:12.

142 Gal 5:4.

143 Gal 5:2.

work let us go on to the rest, beloved, calling, on God for aid as usual, on the subject of the rest, and in their description and refutation.

Against Antidicomarians[1] *58, but 78 of the series*

1,1 Certain other problems have been caused, especially in Arabia, by this sect—which some call the sect of the Dimoerites, or the sect which confesses Christ's human nature[2] without a mind—and they have been referred to my modest self by some of the godly. (2) And first I have already written a letter on this subject. But to keep to my order of the enumeration [of sects] I shall discuss this one here too, < by inserting > the letter in its entirety, with the appropriate additions or omissions.

1,3 As though they had a grudge against the Virgin and desired to cheapen her reputation, certain Antidicomarians, inspired by some envy or error and intending to sully men's minds, have dared to say that St. Mary had relations with a man after Christ's birth, I mean with Joseph himself. (4) And as I have already mentioned, it is said that the claim has been made by the venerable Apollinarius himself, or some of his disciples. Indeed I doubt it[3] but I have to speak about those who are saying this. But so as not to involve myself in a second hard task I subjoin the letter to Arabia which I have mentioned. It is as follows:

2,1 *Greetings in the Lord from Epiphanius, least of bishops, to my most honored Masters and beloved children and brothers in Arabia who share my orthodox faith, clergy, laity and catechumens!*

2,2 *There is reason to wonder at present, and reason not to wonder. There is reason to wonder, since all things are being fulfilled in our generation, and reason not to wonder, since they must be fulfilled. For day after day we are now increasingly faced with the speculation of human reasonings and fancies, sophistical in its nature and growing worse, which deserts the apostolic doctrine, as the most holy apostle foretold, "Many shall depart from sound doctrine, giving heed to fables and doctrines of devils,"*[4] *and so on.* (3) *For if it is possible to look for evil ways and think them up, men exert themselves < in the search > for these, rather than obeying the commandment which*

---

[1] The bulk of this Sect consists of Epiphanius' Letter to Arabia, which is quoted entire. The sources of his information were oral, chiefly members of the groups to whom the letter is addressed.

[2] Holl ὁμολογούσης, MSS ὀνομαζομένης.

[3] Drexl and MSS ὅ καὶ ἀμφιβάλλω, περὶ δὲ . . . Holl ἀμφιβάλλω <εἰ οὕτως τοῦτο λέγει>.

[4] 1 Tim 4:1.

bids them seek the good and acceptable, and < the injunction >, "Let thy speech be seasoned with salt, that it may give grace to the hearers."[5]

2,4 *And if we wonder why it is that new ills arise for us each day, we ourselves shall be like the uninstructed, who pay no heed to the sacred, prophetic words. These things must be fulfilled. "When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find the faith on earth?"*[6] *must be fulfilled in all parts of the faith.* (5) *For where has "the mind of man that is bent on evil from his youth"*[7] *got to? Which articles of the faith has it not destroyed? In which works has poor judgment not marred the usefulness of the seemliest writers, of a rationality such that it ought to be reflecting on godly things and making every effort to add to them,* (*even if it should do so contrary to their nature*) *rather than forcibly turning truths into impieties, to their detriment.*

3,1 *For finally, since all that is blasphemous and without the Holy Spirit has been accomplished in our generation, they are turning to other, new blasphemies.* (2) *For some blaspheme the Father, the God and creator of all—those who are said to be Gnostics and the so-called Marcionites and Archontics in their turn, and their companions the Manichaeans, who have been named with entire appropriateness by a righteous providence of God, and < bear > the name of madness.* (3) *All of these, along with further sects—I mean of Cainites, Sethians, Melchizedekians, Colorbasians, Cerdonians and the rest—< venture > to blaspheme the Father of all by denying that he is < the > God who has spoken in the Law and the prophets, and that he is rightly worshiped by all creatures as their maker and artificer.* (4) *Together with his worship they try also to do away with his sovereignty, and deny the God who exists while, by their false thinking, imagining one who does not, so that they are deprived of the true God and do not find the one they imagine.*

3,5 *For it is in this way that foolishness, and the seed of the devil's words, is wont to cause such disturbance and confusion, and with blasphemous thoughts incite the minds of created human beings to war < on > their Master with clumsy conjectures and denials of God.*

3,6 *But while avoiding this, some in their turn have dared to proceed to other evils by the denial of their Master who alone redeemed them, the only-begotten Child Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God, the truly existent Son—begotten of the Father without beginning and not in time, forever*

---

[5] Cf. Phil 4:8; Col 4:6; Eph 4:29.
[6] Luke 18:8.
[7] Gen 8:21.

of the Father and with the Father, begotten incomprehensibly and without defilement, co-essential with the Father and not different from the Father. (7) *Some, again, have gone mad and bark at their own Master like rabid dogs—as the Jews did at the first, and have been called "dumb dogs"*[8] *for not knowing him. They were awarded this name by the prophet, as is plain to see, < because of> their shameless rage at the Lord and his coming.* (8) *For they say that mad dogs are called "dumb" because they are left toothless by their mind on its departure.*

4,1 *For dogs are like this when they go mad. Though they once knew their master, his children, his household, all the householder's other kin, when the madness takes them these persons' faces seem different to them, and they attack even their owner's kinsfolk, in whose honor they once wagged their tails, and to whose ways they once submitted.* (2) *When those who were awaiting the coming of Christ beheld their Master's arrival—though they were prepared to receive the bridegroom, boasted of having seen the prophets, professed to obey their sacred oracles, and covenanted with Moses, "Be thou [for us] to the Lord,"*[9] *and, "All that the Lord saith unto thee we will hear and do"*[10]*—[nonetheless] when they saw their Master's arrival they did not know the appearance and marks of the truth which the prophets before him had portrayed, depicted, proclaimed and pointed to before his incarnation, and at once said to him, first, "Who is this that speaketk blasphemies?"*[11] (3) *But on another occasion they shamelessly ventured to say that he had a demon, and did not blush to call him a Samaritan as well.* (4) *Finally, as I have said, they set on him like mad dogs, nailed his hands < and struck him in the face* >, as a dog in its madness always fastens < on the person before it* > and attacks his hands, and is not ashamed to scratch the faces of its owners.*

4,5 *They gave their own Lord up to crucifixion; and of the prophets, the household of that same Master, they sawed one in half, stoned another, and slew another with the sword.* (6) *But their successors, the new Jews after them, are now behaving in the same way. The actual Jews by birth denied him; and those who, utterly mad and crack-brained, are now denying the truth of the Son's perfect relation to the Father, maintain without intermission that he is a creature and something made, and different from the Father.*

---

[8] Isa 56:40.
[9] Cf. Exod 18:19.
[10] Deut 5:27.
[11] Luke 5:21.

5,1 *Others in turn have abandoned those blasphemous doctrines, and have still, as it were, seen the sight surpassing the nature of heaven itself, visited the heavenly realms, and pried into them. They make their arrogant announcement and confident affirmation as though they had come from the heaven, and banish the Holy Spirit from the Godhead.* (2) *They have not denied the Father or the Son's relation to him, but they go by another route to ensure the complete fulfillment of the prophecy, "Faith hath failed from their lips."*[12] (3) *For what can this mean but that now—as though they had the authority—instead of being commanded by God they wish to command God about the Holy Spirit, who is not different from the Father and the Son, who is of the same Godhead, and who cannot possibly be alien to the Godhead? For they shamelessly say that the Spirit is alien to God, a servant, a creature, of recent origin, and something made, and contrive to get hold of anything else that is shameful, as an opinion of him.*

5,4 *Thus, because of its incurable wound of unbelief, the world of our day has inclined more < and more to evil* >. And that the wickedness which is destroying humanity through perversity, ignorance and unbelief may leave no stone unturned, an idle, foolish notion has diverted those who have, as it were, escaped the blasphemy of the holy Trinity, to other things, leaving no one's sin undetected.*

5,5 *For I hear that someone has a new notion about the holy, ever-virgin Mary, and dares to cast a blasphemous suspicion on her, so that our generation will be exactly like a dangerous serpent and poisonous snake lurking in a dark den and striking everyone with its bites—one near the face, another near the heel, another near the hand—*(6) *so that no one can escape the bite of unbelief. Though one suppose he has escaped it in one way he does not avoid the poison in another, while one whose faith is sound in one respect is exposed to some other form of harm.*

6,1 *Why this ill will? Why so much impudence? Isn't Mary's very name (i.e., "Virgin") a testimony, doesn't it convince you, you trouble-maker? Who, and in which generation, has ever dared to say St. Mary's name and not add "Virgin" at once when asked? The marks of excellence show from the titles of honor themselves.* (2) *For the righteous received the honors of their titles appropriately for each and as it became them. "Friend of God"*[13] *was added to the name, "Abraham," and will not be detached. The title, "Israel," was awarded to "Jacob" and will not be changed. To the apostles the title,*

[12] Jer 7:28.
[13] Jas 2:23.

"Boanerges," or "sons of thunder," was given and will not be discarded. And St. Mary was given the title, "Virgin," and it will not be altered, for the holy woman remained undefiled. "Doth not nature itself teach you?"[14] *Oh, this new madness, these new troubles!*

6,3 *There are many other things which the fathers did not venture to say in times gone by. Now, however, one blasphemes Christ's incarnation by talking heresy about the Godhead itself, while another considers the entire matter of the incarnation defective; another is troubled about the resurrection of the dead, and someone else < by another > point.* (4) *And in a word, woe to our troubled generation with its salvation in peril, swamped on every side by the wicked second sowings of the devil's sick fancies and heretical reasonings!* (5) *How dare they < so degrade* * *> the undefiled Virgin who was privileged to become the Son's habitation, and was chosen for this from all the myriads of Israel, so that something deemed worthy to be a vessel and dwelling place is to become a mere sign of child-bearing?*

7,1 *For I have heard from someone that certain persons are venturing to say that she had marital relations after the Savior's birth. And I am not surprised. The ignorance of persons who do not know the sacred scriptures well and have not consulted histories, always turns them to one thing after another, and distracts anyone who wants to track down something about the truth out of his own head.* (2) *To begin with, when the Virgin was entrusted to Joseph*[15]*—lots having compelled her to take this step—she was not entrusted to him for marriage, since he was a widower.* (3) *He was called her husband because of the Law, but it is plainly follows from the Jewish tradition that the Virgin was not entrusted to him for matrimony.* (4) *It was for the preservation of her virginity in witness to the things to come—[a witness] that Christ's incarnation was nothing spurious but was truly attested, as without a man's seed < but> truly brought about by the Holy Spirit.*

7,5 *For how could such an old man,*[16] *who had lost his first wife so many years before, take a virgin for a wife? Joseph was the brother of Cleopas but the son of Jacob surnamed Panther; both of these brothers were the sons of the man surnamed Panther.* (6) *Joseph took his first wife from the tribe of Judah and she bore him six children in all, four boys and two girls, as the Gospels according to Mark and John have made clear.*[17] (7) *His firstborn*

[14] 1 Cor 14:14.
[15] Cf. Protevangelium of James 9.1.
[16] Cf. Protevangelium of James 9.2.
[17] Cf. Mark 6:3; John 19:25.

son was James, whose surname was Oblias, or "wall,"[18] *and who was also surnamed "The Just" and was a nazirite, or "holy man."* (8) *He was the first to receive the episcopal throne,*[19] *the first to whom the Lord entrusted his throne on earth.* (9) *He was also called the Lord's brother, as the apostle agrees by saying somewhere, "But other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother,"*[20] *and so on. But he is called the Lord's brother not by nature but by grace, because of being brought up with him.* (10) *For because she had been betrothed to Joseph Mary appeared to be the wife of a husband, but she had no sexual relations with him. For this reason the degree of the kinship of Joseph's sons to the Savior was called, or rather, regarded as, that of brotherhood.*

7,11 *Similarly Joseph himself is held by dispensation to be in the position of a father, though he had had no part in the fleshly generation of the Savior. Thus Luke the evangelist says of the Savior himself that he was "the son of Joseph, as was supposed"*[21] *and Mary too said to him the Gospel according to Luke, "Behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing."*[22] (12) *Who, then, can call Joseph the Lord's father when he had no responsibility for his generation, especially when the incarnation took place without a man's seed? But by the dispensation of providence this is how matters fell out.*

8,1 *Joseph begot James when he was somewhere around forty years old. After him he had a son named Joses—then Simeon after him, then Judah, and two daughters, one named Mary and one, Salome; and his wife died.* (2) *And many years later, as a widower of over eighty, he took Mary. So we are told in the Gospel, for it says, "Mary, his espoused wife;"*[23] *it didn't say, "married wife." And again, in another passage it says, "And he knew her not."*[24] (3) *One can only wonder at all <the allegations*>*[25] *of those who look for wicked allegations, who <strive*> to discover the causes which need no discovery and to investigate the uninvestigable, but who turn from the essentials to foolish questions, so that we may surely catch the plague of every kind of unbelief and blasphemy because of the dishonoring of the saints.*

---

[18] Cf. Hegesippus in Eus. H. E. 3.23.7.
[19] Cf. Clem. Hom. Ep. Clementis Ad Jacobum 1.
[20] Gal 1:19.
[21] Luke 3:23.
[22] Luke 2:48.
[23] Matt 1:18.
[24] Matt 1:25.
[25] Holl: <προφασιζονται> οἱ προφάσεις θηρώμενοι πονηρὰς καὶ <σπουδάζοντες>, MSS οἷς οἱ προφάσεις θηρῶνται οἱ πονηροί.

8,4 *In the first place, the course of nature entirely confutes them. To begin with, an old man of over eighty did not take a virgin as a sexual partner; she was committed to his protection. Secondly, he himself was surely "just";*[26] *and when he had heard that that which was in her was "of the Holy Spirit"* [27] *he would not have dared to keep wanting her after such a providence, < and > use the vessel that had contained him whom heaven and earth cannot contain because of his transcendent glory.* (5) *Even if today many of the faithful strive to remain virgin in his name, and pure and continent, wasn't Joseph more faithful? And Mary herself who, as scripture says, "pondered all things in her heart."* [28] *After a dispensation of that sort, of such greatness and importance, < how could it not be wrong> for an elderly man to have relations once more, with a pure and honored virgin, a vessel which had contained the Uncontainable and had received such a mystery of a heavenly sign and man's salvation?*

9,1 *Where can I not find proof that the Virgin remained pure? For a starter, let them show me that Mary bore children after the Savior's birth! Let these designers and reciters of deceit and mischief make the names up and give them! But they can't show them because she was still a virgin and, perish the thought, had no sexual relations!* (2) *If she had ever born children even though she was always with the Savior himself, her children too would be said to be with < him >.*

But the text, "Lo, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, seeking thee," [29] *misleads them.* (3) *Besides, they do not know the earlier passage, "His brethren believed < not > on him.*[30] *As I myself grow older and wonder at the triviality of the things in the sacred scriptures—I can tell you, as I become fully acquainted with them I thank God for taking the precaution to prove the truth of every text in the sacred scripture by the seemingly trivial words.* (4) *I always heard that James was called the Lord's brother, and I said in wonderment, "What's the use of this?" But now I understand why the sacred scripture said this beforehand. When we hear, "Lo, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, seeking thee,"* (5) *let us by all means learn that it is speaking of James and the other sons of Joseph, and not of sons of Mary whom she never had.*

---

[26] Cf. Matt 1:19.
[27] Matt 1:20.
[28] Luke 2:19.
[29] Matt 12:47.
[30] John 7:5.

For it was plain that, in comparison with the [years of] the Lord's incarnation, James was the elder. (6) *The scripture calls them brothers to confound [our opponents], and names James, Joses, Simeon, Judah, Salome and Mary, so that they will learn whose son James is and by which mother, and understand who is the elder.*

Jesus was crucified in the thirty-third year of his incarnation, but it was the twentieth year of Herod the son of Archelaus. (10,1) *For the Savior was born in Bethlehem of Judaea in the thirty-third year of the first Herod, the son of Antipater, which was the forty-second of the emperor Augustus.* (2) *And at the age of two he was taken to Egypt by Joseph because of what the magi had told him, since Herod was seeking < to destroy > the child.*

10,3 *King Herod died in the thirty-seventh year of his reign, but his son Archelaus reigned for nine years after him.* (4) *And the work [of salvation] was finished, and Jesus was crucified in the eighteenth year of Tiberius Caesar; it was the twentieth year of Agrippa called "The Great," or Herod the Younger, the son of Archelaus.* (5) *But nowhere have we heard that Joseph fathered [more] sons. Indeed, he did not live many years after his return from Egypt, for it was the Savior's fourth year, while Joseph was over eighty-four when he arrived from Egypt.* (6) *And Joseph survived for another eight years; and in Jesus' twelfth year, as it says in the Gospel according to Luke, he was sought for on their journey to Jerusalem, when he could not be found on the road.*

10,7 *But Joseph died during these years, and Jesus was no longer brought up by Joseph, but in Joseph's home. This is why the Gospel can no longer say that his father and mother and brethren came, but says, "Lo, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, seeking thee."*[31] (8) *Nor did it say that his father and brothers had spoken to him, when they said to him in Galilee, "No one that doeth these things would be in secret; if thou doest these things, show thyself."*[32] *It said that his brothers had spoken to him; Joseph was no longer alive in the flesh.* (9) *But then at his perfecting itself, when the Savior was on the cross, the Lord turned, as the Gospel according to John tells us, "and saw the disciple whom he loved, and said to him of Mary, "Behold thy mother". And to her he said, "Behold thy son."*[33] (10) *If Mary had children and her husband was alive, why did he entrust Mary to John and John to Mary? And*

[31] Matt 12:47.
[32] Cf. John 7:4.
[33] John 19:26–27.

why not rather entrust her to Peter'? Why not to Andrew, Matthew and Bartholomew? But it is plain that he entrusted her to John because of virginity.

10,11 *For < he says >, "Behold thy mother," even though physically she was not John's mother; [he says this] to show that < as > the originator of virginity she was his mother, since the life began with her.* (12) *And lest it be supposed that the work [of salvation] was appearance and not reality he said this to John to teach him to honor his own mother, even though, physically speaking, John was not his kin; for the Lord was truly born of her in the flesh.* (13) *For if she had not truly been the mother who bore him, he would not have taken care to entrust the Ever-virgin to John—his mother because of the incarnation, but undefiled in his honor and the wondrous vessel. But the Gospel says, "And from that day he took her unto his own home."*[34] *But if she had a husband, a home, children, she would return to her own home and not to someone else's.*

11,1 *But this must not be twisted to the harm of any who suppose that, by a clumsy conjecture, they can find an excuse here to invent their so-called "adoptive wives" and "beloved friends." The things done there were done by dispensation, and the case is different from all the other godly stringent rules that ought to be observed. Indeed, when this had been done and John had taken her to himself, she was not yet living with him.* (2) *If any think < I > am mistaken, moreover, let them search through the scriptures and neither find Mary's death, nor whether or not she died, nor whether or not she was buried—even though John surely traveled throughout Asia. And yet, nowhere does he say that he took the holy Virgin with him. Scripture simply kept silence because of the overwhelming wonder, not to throw men's minds into consternation.*

11,3 *For I dare not say—though I have my suspicions, I keep silent. Perhaps, just as her death is not to be found, so I may have found some traces of the holy and blessed Virgin.* (4) *In one passage Simeon says of her, "And a sword shall pierce through thine own soul also, that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed."*[35] *And elsewhere the Revelation of John says, "And the dragon hastened after the woman who had born the man child, and she was given the wings of an eagle and was taken to the wilderness, that the dragon might not seize her."*[36] *Perhaps this can be applied to her; I cannot*

---

[34] John 19:27.
[35] Luke 2:35.
[36] Cf. Rev 12:13–14.

decide for certain, and am not saying that she remained immortal. But neither am I affirming that she died.

11,5 *For scripture went beyond man's understanding and left it in suspense with regard to the precious and choice vessel, so that no one would suspect carnal behavior of her. Whether she died, I don't know; and [even] if she was buried, she never had carnal relations, perish the thought!* (6) *Who will choose, from self-inflicted insanity, to cast a blasphemous suspicion [on her], raise his voice, give free rein to his tongue, flap his mouth with evil intent, invent insults instead of hymns and glory, hurl abuse at the holy Virgin, and deny honor to the precious Vessel?*

12,1 *But if we need to take the matter up from another point of view, let's examine the findings of the naturalists. They say that a lioness never gives birth but once, for the following reason. A lion is very fierce, grim of visage, of extremely violent strength, and, as it were, the king of the other beasts.* (2) *A lioness conceives by one mate, but the implanted seed remains in the womb for a full twenty-six months. Thus the cub comes to maturity inside its mother because of the time, and already has all its teeth before it is born, and its claws fully developed, and, as they call them, its "incisors, eye-teeth and molars," and all the beast's remaining features.* (3) *Thus while it is in the belly it rakes it with its claws in the course of its upward and forward movements and its other twists, and scrapes the wombs and ovaries that are carrying it. And so, when the mother has come to birth, that very day her belly becomes incapable of labor.* (4) *For the naturalists say that the ovaries and wombs are expelled with the cub, so that the lioness no longer feels desire unless, perhaps, she is forced. And even if it should happen that she is forced to mate, she can never conceive again because she has no wombs or ovaries.*

12,5 *Now even this series of events has given me a notion, beneficial rather than harmful, on the subject in question.* (6) *If Jacob says, "Judah is a lion's whelp,"*[37] *symbolically of Christ, and somewhere in John's Revelation it says, "Behold, the lion of the tribe of Judah, and the seed of David, hath prevailed"*[38]*—(when the Lord is compared to a lion it is not because of his nature, but symbolically, and because of the kingliness of the beast, < the > boldest, strongest, and in all other respects the handsomest of the animals.) [If the Lord is a lion], then, I should call the mother who bore him a lioness;* (7) *how can any lion be born if the mother is not to be called a lioness? But*

[37] Gen 49:9.
[38] Rev 5:5.

a lioness does not conceive a second time. Therefore Mary never conceives again; the holy Virgin cannot have had marital relations.

13,1 *But let us look to other considerations too, to < make the truth hevident in every way* >; since it was always with him, the truth < was* > a follower of Jesus. "Jesus was called to a marriage," and "his mother < was > there."*[39] *And < nowhere > are his brothers mentioned, and nowhere Joseph. < For he says >, "Woman, what have I to do with thee? Mine hour is not yet come"*[40] *He didn't say, "People, what have I to do with you?"*

13,2 *Mary Magdalene stood by the cross, and Mary the wife of Cleopas, and Mary the mother of Rufus, and the other Mary, and Salome, and other women. And it didn't say, "Joseph was there"—or "James the Lord's brother," < who > died in virginity < at the age > of ninety-six.* (3) *No iron implement had touched his head, he had never visited a bath house, had never eaten meat.*[41] *He did not own a change of clothing and wore only a threadbare linen garment, as it says in the Gospel, "The young man fled, and left the cloth wherewith he was clad."*[42]

13,4 *John, James and James, these three, lived in virginity—the two sons of Zebedee and James, who was the son of Joseph and the Lord's brother because he had lived with him, had been brought up with him, and had the status of a brother because of Joseph's only relationship to Mary, her betrothal to him.* (5) *Only this James was allowed to enter the Holy of Holies once a year*[43] *since he was a nazirite and a member of the priesthood. Thus Mary was related to Elizabeth in two ways*[44] *and James was distinguished by priesthood, since only the two tribes intermarried, the kingly with the priestly and the priestly with the kingly. Thus long ago the head of the tribe of Judah, Naason, took < the > ancient Elizabeth, Aaron's daughter, to wife during the exodus.* (6) *Hence many sects are unaware of <the> Savior's earthly genealogy, and because of their puzzlement disbelieve, and suppose that they can contradict the truth by saying "How could Mary, of the tribe of David and Judah, be related to Elizabeth, of the tribe of Levi?"*

14,1 *James also wore the priestly diadem. And once he raised his hands to heaven and prayed during a drought, and heaven immediately gave rain.*

---

[39] John 2:1–2.
[40] John 2:4.
[41] Cf. Hegesippus in Eus. H. E. 2.23.5–7.
[42] Mark 14:52.
[43] The basis of this is probably the notice at Eus. H. E. 2.23.6.
[44] Cf. Julius Africanus Epistula Ad Aristidem, Reichardt, p. 54.

He never put on a woolen garment.[45] *From their continual kneeling before the Lord with extreme piety, his knees grew as hard as camels'.* (2) *He was no longer addressed by name; his name was "The Just." He never washed in the bath house, did not eat meat, as I have already said, and did not put on a sandal. And a great deal could be said about James and his virtuous life.*

14,3 *You see, then, that Joseph's home was most remarkable in every way. For if Joseph's sons knew the state of virginity and the practice of the nazirites, how much more did the elderly and honorable Joseph know how to preserve the Virgin in purity, and pay honor to the vessel in which humankind's salvation had once dwelt? "Doth not nature itself teach you?"*[46] (4) *The man was aged, very far advanced in years, and a man of standing, faithful character and pious demeanor. For the Gospel says, "From fear of God the man sought to put her away privily."*[47]

14,5 *This James, the Lord's brother and Joseph's son, died in Jerusalem, after living for about twenty-four years after the assumption of the Savior.*[48] *For at the age of ninety-six he was struck on the head with a fuller's rod, was thrown from the pinnacle of the temple* (6) *and fell without injury, but knelt in prayer for those who had thrown him down and said, "Forgive them, for they know not what they do."*[49] *Meanwhile Simeon, his cousin but the son of Cleopas, stood at a distance and said, "Stop! Why are you stoning the Just? And look, he's praying for you the best he can!" And this was the martyrdom of James.*

15,1 *Now if Joseph's son lived for so many years, how could his father dare to abuse and insult a holy body in which God had dwelt, after he had seen awesome sights, angels standing guard at the birth of the Son, singing hymns from heaven and saying, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men?"*[50] *And the shepherds had come to the cavern where Christ was born* (2) *and told these things, so many signs and wonders, in the hearing of the aged Joseph, who was far advanced in years.* (3) *The incarnate Christ's human nature was taken from Mary's body for us—the body from which the holy and undefiled flesh was formed for us, in the Savior's Godhead. As the angel Gabriel < says > in the relevant passage, "The Spirit of the Lord shall come upon thee, and the power of the highest shall*

---

45 Cf. Hegesippus in Eus. H. E. 2.23.6.
46 1 Cor 11:14.
47 Cf. Matt 1:19.
48 Hegesippus in Eus. H. E. 2.23.16–18.
49 Luke 23:34.
50 Luke 2:13–15.

overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."[51]

15,4 *Now how could Joseph dare to have relations with the Virgin Mary who was of such, and so great, holiness? But even if she had sexual relations—and perish that thought!—what good would it do us to inquire into this? Which is the better choice, to leave the matter to God, or to insist on what is bad for us? Plainly, scripture has not told us that we may not have eternal life, but will go to judgment, unless we believe that Mary had relations again.* (5) *It has, however, told us < to seek > what is good and righteous, what is holy, "that we may give grace unto the hearers also."*[52] *But people have abandoned the essentials, things that relate to faith in the truth, that are to the glory of God, and provide themselves with harmful things wherever they can find them. How disgusting it is even to think of < them >, especially as scripture says nothing of the sort.*

16,1 *For if the scripture said it, I would expound the proof-text truth< fully *> and think nothing of it. Is marriage unholy, after all? Is the marriage bed profane? Isn't "the bed undefiled?"*[53] *Is marriage debased? But prophets and high priests refrain from it because their service is for a higher purpose.* (2) *After Moses became a prophet he had no more relations with his wife, she bore no more children, and he fathered no more. For he had adopted a way of life which afforded more leisure for his Master. How could he remain on Mount Sinai "for forty nights and forty days"*[54] *and still attend to his marriage? Or how [else] could he ready for ministry to God in the wilderness for forty years, and find the leisure for priesthood?*

If he was married, how could be continually expound the mysteries and converse with God? (3) *For if the holy apostle speaks expressly of us, and says, "< Let them be continent* > for a time, that they may be free for prayer,"*[55] *how much more will the saying be true of prophets?*

Moreover, Mary was a prophetess. (4) *Scripture says, "He went in unto the prophetess, and she conceived and bare a son. And the Lord said unto me, Call his name, Spoil Speedily, Plunder Fiercely, "and so on.*[56] (5) *The meaning here, however, is Gabriel's visit to Mary, when he went forth to bring her*

---

[51] Luke 1:35.
[52] Eph 4:29.
[53] Heb 13:4.
[54] Exod 24:18.
[55] 1 Cor 7:5.
[56] Isa 8:3.

the tidings that she would bear God's Son, a Savior, for the world, not by the seed of a man but through the Holy Spirit.

16,6 *Moreover, Philip the evangelist had "four daughters that did prophesy,"*[57] *but they prophesied because of the virginity that was vouchsafed them.* (7) *Thecla too met St. Paul and dissolved her marriage, although her betrothed was most handsome, the leading man in the town, extremely rich, of excellent family, and very prominent. And yet the saint despised earthly things to gain the heavenly.*[58] (8) *Now if these persons [did] these things, how much more Mary, to whom the whole wondrous providence has come? But where can I find ideas to benefit them? How can I dispel the darkness of those who have spawned these dreadful doctrines, as the scripture says, "He hath conceived pain and brought forth iniquity?"*[59] *For these people do indeed conceive the pain of sick fancies, and bring forth the iniquity of blasphemies.*

17,1 *But no one should have those suspicions and say, in his attempt to implant them within himself in a different way, "Why does the Gospel say, 'Mary was found with child of the Holy Ghost before they came together?' "*[60] *Their coming together was expected, and this is why it said, 'before they came together.'* (2) *Furthermore, the same Gospel says once more, in another passage, 'She brought forth her son, the firstborn,' and, 'He knew her not until she had brought forth her son, the firstborn.' "*[61]

17,3 *And yet those who profess to distinguish between the senses of the scriptures* (i.e., literal, allegorical etc.) *and try to meddle with the loftiest and the deepest matters, do not know that the sense of this is as follows.* (4) *For if Mary had given birth again, scripture should have given the other brothers' names too. But never fear, if the Only-begotten < is called "firstborn" >, don't worry, it is because he is the "firstborn of all creation."*[62] *The Gospels did not say, "She brought forth her firstborn," but, "He knew her not until she had brought forth her son"—and it didn't say, "her firstborn," but, "the firstborn."* (5) *By "her son," scripture meant what had been born of her in the flesh. But it didn't add another "her" to the term, "firstborn," but said imply, "firstborn."*

---

[57] Acts 21:9.
[58] Acts of Paul and Thecla 7.10.
[59] Ps 7:15.
[60] Matt 1:18.
[61] Matt 1:25.
[62] Col 1:15.

For he is the One the apostle calls, "firstborn of all creation"—not united with creation but begotten before creation. (6) *The apostle didn't say, "first-created," but, "firstborn"; and the passage is divided for its better and sounder interpretation by saying "firstborn" first, and then mentioning creation as inferior. For "firstborn" is understood of the Son, but "creation" < was made > through the Son.* (7) *Thus "She brought forth her son, the firstborn;"—but not "her firstborn," as though she was to bear another.*

"And he knew her not." For how could he know that a woman would receive so much grace? Or how could he know that < the > Virgin would be so highly glorified? (8) *He knew that she was a woman by her appearance, and her womanliness by her sex, and knew that her mother was Ann and her father, Joachim, that she was related to Elizabeth, that she was of the house and lineage of David. But he did not know that anyone on earth, especially a woman, would be honored with such glory.* (9) *He did not know her, then, until he had seen the wonder; he did not know how wondrous she was until he had seen "that which was born of her."*[63] *But when she gave birth he also knew the honor God had done her, for it was she who had been told, "Hail, thou that art highly favored, the Lord is with thee."*[64]

18,1 *It is Mary who is intimated by Eve, for she was symbolically given the title, "mother of the living." For Eve was called "mother of the living"*[65] *in that passage," and this after being told, "Earth thou art, and unto earth shall thou return"*[66] *following her transgression. And yet, it was a a wonder that she received the great title after this transgression.* (2) *Physically speaking, every birth of human beings on earth is from that Eve; but here life itself has truly been born into the world of Mary, so that Mary brings forth the Living One and becomes the mother of the Living.* (3) *Mary, then, was mystically called the "mother of the living." For "Who has given the woman the wisdom < of weaving > and skill in embroidery?"*[67] *was said of the two women. The first wise woman, Eve,< was > the weaver of earthly garments for Adam whose nakedness she had caused; for this task was assigned to her.* (4) *Since the nakedness was her fault, she had been given the task of clothing the physical body to hide its physical nakedness. But God's assignment to Mary was that she bear a lamb and sheep for us, and that, by his virtue, we*

---

[63] Luke 1:35.
[64] Luke 1:28.
[65] Gen 3:20.
[66] Gen 3:19.
[67] Job 38:36.

receive a garment of immortality wisely made—as though from his fleece—from the glory of the lamb and sheep.

18,5 *But there is another marvel to ponder in connection with these women, Eve and Mary. Eve has become the occasion of human deaths, for "Death entered into the world"*[68] *through her. But Mary, through whom Life was born for us, is the occasion of life.* (6) *And this is why the Son of God came into the world; and "Where sin hath abounded, grace did much more abound."*[69] *And in the place from which death came, life got the start of it, so that there might be Life in place of death. He who, in his turn, had become our life through a woman, shut out the death that came from a woman.*

18,7 *And since Eve in Paradise fell into the sin of disobedience while still a virgin, the obedience of grace in its turn has come through the Virgin, when she was told of the descent from heaven, of the coming in the flesh and eternal life.* (8) *For in Paradise God tells the serpent, "And I shall put enmity between thee and her, and between thy seed, and her seed."*[70] *But there is no instance of a woman's seed < with an enmity toward the physical seed of a snake* >, unless, as the riddle suggests, the "enmity" is taken to mean Eve's enmity towards the progeny of the snake itself, and of the devil who dwelt in the snake, and his envy.*

19,1 *And in fact, the whole cannot have its complete fulfillment in Eve. But it will truly be fulfilled in the holy Seed, the elect Seed, the unique Seed, the Seed which originated from Mary alone, and not from union with a man. For he came to "destroy" the "power of the dragon and crooked serpent which flees"*[71] *saying that it has taken the whole world captive.* (2) *And so the Only-begotten came from a woman for the destruction of the serpent— that is, of heresy, corruption and deceit, imposture and iniquity.* (3) *It is he who truly "opens a mother's womb."*[72] *All the firstborn who have ever been born—to put it delicately—could not manage this; none but the Only-begotten, who "opened a virgin's womb." That has been accomplished in him alone, and in no one else.*

19,4 *But this*[73] *can also be seen from the subject itself. The expression, ["mother of the living"], is to be understood of Mary, and I shall take the one that says, "For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother and*

---

[68] Cf. Rom 5:12.
[69] Rom 5:20.
[70] Gen 3:15.
[71] Isa 27:1.
[72] Cf. Luke 2:23 (Exod. 13:12).
[73] That not all the statements in Gen. 2–3 are to be taken of Eve.

shall cleave unto his wife, and the two shall become one flesh,"[74] *as a reference to the church.* (5) *The holy apostle also says, "This is a great mystery, but I say it concerns Christ and the church."*[75] (6) *And see the precision of the scriptures! It says, "formed,"*[76] *of Adam, but of Eve it no longer speaks of being "formed," but of being "built." For it says, "He took one of his sides and built it into a wife for him,"*[77] *to show that the Lord formed his body from Mary, but the church has been built from his side itself—when his side was pierced, and the mysteries of blood and water became atonements for us.*

20,1 *But in any case Joseph knew Mary, not with any knowledge of physical intimacy, not with the knowledge of intercourse—he knew her, and honored her whom God had honored. For he did not know how glorious she was until he saw the Lord who was born of a woman.* (2) *And "Before they came together she was found with child"*[78] *is said to keep the argument of those who think that the God-ordained mystery came from sexual commerce from prevailing. For it meant, "before this thing that was expected took place—but the thing did not take place."* (3) *For even if it was expected that the Virgin would have relations with Joseph, an impossibility because of his age, the holy scripture shows us in advance, and confirms our notion, < to > convince < us > that, although the thing is possible despite the sacred childbirth, no man < may > ever again approach the Virgin for sexual relations—convincing us in the same way in which the angel convinced Joseph that his suspicion was unfounded.* (4) *For there is a similarity between "before they came together," which means that this was expected but did not happen, and, "Being a righteous man he sought not to make her a public example but to put her away privily,"*[79] *which means that he would become evil if he made her a public example, but he did not. In the same way the angel teaches him, "Fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife'"*[80] *though she had not yet become his wife, "even if you suspect her of a fall"; but she is not what you think," and so on.* (5) *For he says directly after that, "for that which was conceived in her,"*[81] *as though it had already occurred,*[82] *but then, "she shall bear a son,"*[83] *as of a*

---

[74] Gen 2:24.
[75] Eph 5:32.
[76] Gen 2:7.
[77] Gen 2:21–22.
[78] Matt 1:18.
[79] Cf. Matt 1:25.
[80] Matt 1:20.
[81] Matt 1:20.
[82] Eltester γεγενημένον, Holl and MSS γεγεννημένου.
[83] Matt 1:21.

future event; and she did. (6) *And the prediction*[84] *< has come down to us* > because its truth has been demonstrated, just as "before they came together" < has come down to us* > because we are satisfied*[85] *that no such thing has occurred. "Until she brought forth her son, the firstborn," is to be interpreted along the same lines,*[86] *because of the marvel of the knowledge of the Virgin, with her honor in the sight of God.*

21,1 *But no one should suppose that because it says, "before they came together," they came together later on. No one can prove this or show it; scripture has provided this added confirmation to show that the Savior's conception was undefiled. "[Joseph] knew her not" is said to her glory;* (2) *"firstborn " is said because he is the Firstborn, before there are any creatures, and the "firstborn among many brethren"*[87] *as the apostle said—not brethren by < birth > from Mary as though she bore other sons, but the brethren who were vouchsafed adoption as sons through him when, to remove any suspicion of docetism, he truly became her son in the flesh.* (3) *What is more, he was the firstborn and the son of the Virgin herself—not, as I said, because she had other sons. For this is similar to his first birth before the incarnation. He who is truly the Father's heavenly Firstborn before all creation, is not called Firstborn because there were others begotten of the Father after him. Because he is Only-begotten, he has no second brother.* (4) *Thus he was always Mary's firstborn during his sojourn on earth, but since he had no second brother bom of her, he was Mary's only child.*

Those who have invented things that will hurt and not help them must stop. Don't do it! Please don't! (5) *He who honors the Lord, also honors his holy < vessel >; he who dishonors the holy < vessel >, dishonors his own Master as well. Leave Mary the holy vessel, the holy Virgin, alone! These harmful < contrivances > are of no use to us; we must think more reverently, or we will become proud, or contentious, or garrulous.* (6) *For as the scripture says, We shall "give account for every idle word.*[88] *Let us look after ourselves, <then>, and mind our own business. Let us not attribute our behavior to the saints, not look at the saints' lives in terms of our own.*

22,1 *For some who are who are constrained and inclined to sensuality and have within them a pernicious expectation [of it], would doubtless like to smear the saints as well, to provide a plausible excuse for their wicked,*

---

[84] I.e., "She shall bear a son."
[85] Holl ἀρκουμένοις, MSS ἀρκούμενοι.
[86] Cf. 17,4–7.
[87] Rom 8:29.
[88] Matt 12:36.

weak-willed expectation. To them the apostle says, "I would that all men were as myself."[89] *But why does he say, "myself," except because of his purity?*

22,2 *"But because of fornication, let each have his own wife!"*[90] *But the pronoun has been left out; Paul said this for a reproof, and to convert them. He could have said, "because of your fornication." He left "your" out, however, not to appear to have said this as abuse of anyone.* (3) *But the words were spoken in condemnation of certain persons who were unwilling to free themselves for God, as our fathers of old used to do after living in accordance with the Law and knowing their own vessels fittingly for procreation. I have found a scripture somewhere that says, "Rebecca conceived of one."*[91] (4) *By saying, "of one," he described it politely but showed that her conception was a righteous one. He is telling us that, once he had children, Jacob had no further relations with his wife.*

22,5 *But it is a simple and easy matter for our minds to be diverted to evils instead of the essentials. Our human reason is shaky, and not quick to direct its zeal into the Lord's straight path. It veers sometimes to the right and sometimes to the left, and finds it hard to obey Solomon's injunction, "Turn not to the right hand, nor to the left.*[92] (6) *Since our wickedness is taking another turn with regard to the same thoughts, and urges our good sense to go off on other paths, let us make sure that excessive praise of the Virgin does not become another occasion of delusion for anyone.*

23,1 *For in blasphemy of the Son, some, as I have already indicated, have done their best to make him literally different from the Father's Godhead. Others again, whose views are different, have said that the Father is the same, the Son is the same, and the Holy Spirit is the same, as though, if you please, they had been encouraged to honor the Son too highly. In both cases the plague is incurable.*

23,2 *Similarly, some have dared to speak insolently of this holy and blessed Ever-virgin, as though she had had sexual relations after that greatest and unsullied providence of the Lord, his incarnation. And of all wickedness, this is the most impious.* (3) *But even as I say < that I am astonished > to learn how some have dared to give themselves to [the] sin with the utmost readiness, I am once more astonished to hear the other. For < I have heard > in turn that others, who are out of their minds on the subject of this holy Ever-virgin, have done and are doing their best, in the grip both of some madness*

---

[89] 1 Cor 7:7.
[90] 1 Cor 7:2.
[91] Rom 9:10.
[92] Prov 4:27.

and of folly, to substitute her for God. (4) *For they say that certain Thracian women there in Arabia have introduced this nonsense, and that they bake a loaf in the name of the Ever-virgin, gather together, and < both > attempt an excess and undertake a forbidden, blasphemous act in the holy Virgin's name, and offer sacrifice in her name with woman officiants.*

This is entirely impious, unlawful, and different from the Holy Spirit's message, and is thus pure devil's work, and the doctrine of an unclean spirit. (5) *The words, "Some shall depart from sound doctrine, giving heed to fables and doctrines of devils,"*[93] *apply to these people as well. For as the scriptures say, they will be "worshiping the dead"*[94] *as the dead were given divine honors in Israel. And the glory of the saints, which redounds to God in its due season, has become an error for others, who do not see the truth.*

23,6 *For in Shechem, that is, the present day Neapolis, the inhabitants offer sacrifices in the name of Core, supposedly because of Jephthah's daughter who was once offered to God as a sacrifice. And for those who have been taken in by it, this has become the misfortune of idolatry and vain worship.* (7) *And because Pharaoh's daughter honored God's servant Moses, and took him up and reared him, the Egyptians honored her to excess in place of God because of the fame of the child in those days, and by an evil tradition have handed this down to the foolish as an observance. And they worship Thermutis the daughter of Amenophis*[95] *who was Pharaoh until that time, because, as I said, she reared Moses.*

23,8 *And there have been many such things to mislead the deluded, though the saints are not responsible for anyone's stumbling; the human mind finds no rest, but is perverted to evils.* (9) *The holy virgin may have died and been buried—her falling asleep was with honor, her death in purity, her crown in virginity. Or she may have been put to death—as the scripture says, "And a sword shall pierce through her soul"*[96]*—her fame is among the martyrs and her holy body, by which light rose on the world, [rests] amid blessings. Or she may have remained alive, for God is not incapable of doing whatever he wills. No one knows her end.*

But we must not honor the saints to excess; we must honor their Master. (10) *It is time for the error of those who have gone astray to cease. Mary is not God and does not have her body from heaven but by human conception, though, like Isaac, she was provided by promise.* (11) *And no one should*

---

[93] 1 Tim 4:1.
[94] Cf. Didache 6.3.
[95] Jos. C. Ap. 1.26.230–232; Ant. 2.5.224–226; Theoph. Ad Autol. 3.20.
[96] Cf. Luke 2:35.

make offerings in her name, for he is destroying his own soul. But neither, in turn, should he be insolent and offer insult to the holy Virgin. Heaven forbid, she had no sexual relations after or before the Savior's conception.

24,1 *I have thought these few points through and put them in writing for those who are willing to learn the truth of the scripture, and not talk wildly and sharpen their blasphemous tongues to no purpose.* (2) *But if any prefer to object, and receive not what is beneficial but the opposite, I too will have to say, despite my insignificance, "'Let him that heareth, hear, and him that disobeyeth, disobey';*[97] *'let no man trouble' the apostles any more, or 'me.'"* [98] (3) *What I knew to be reverent and of use to the church I have said of the holy Virgin, in defense of her who is in every way favored, as Gabriel said, "Hail, thou that art highly favored, the Lord is with thee!"* [99] *But if the Lord is with her, how can she be a partner in another union? How can she have intercourse with flesh, when she is preserved by the Lord?* (4) *The saints are in honor, their repose is in glory, their departure in perfection, their portion in blessedness, among the holy women alone. Their choir is with the angels, their dwelling in heaven, their manner of life in the sacred scriptures. Their fame is in incomparable and perpetual honor. Their rewards are in Christ Jesus our Lord, through whom and with whom be glory to the Father with the Holy Spirit forever. Amen.*

24,5 *All the brethren send you their greetings. And do you yourselves greet all the faithful, orthodox brethren among you, who detest pride and hate the fellowship of the Arians and the foolishness of the Sabellians, but honor the Trinity in its co-essentiality, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, three entities, one essence, one Godhead, and in a word, one glory—and are not in error about our Savior's saving incarnation and advent in the flesh,* (6) *but believe completely in the incarnation of Christ as perfect God and at the same time perfect man except for sin; who took his body itself from Mary, and took a soul and mind, and everything human except for sin—not a Christ who is two, but one Lord, one God, one king, one high priest, God and man, man and God, not two but one, united not as a mixture or as an unreal thing but as a great dispensation of grace. Farewell!*

24,7 Since I am satisfied that the copy of my letter is correct, and am of the opinion that this much will do for a reply to them, I have also passed this sect by in God, as I would a snake peeping out of its hole. I have fully

---

[97] Ezek 3:27.
[98] Gal 6:17.
[99] Luke 1:28.

refuted it with God's wise doctrine and his power—a power that breathes a sweet odor, like storax, on the world in the virtue < of the faithful >, holy children of the virginity which began with Mary, through the light which has dawned on the world through her. I have showed what the evil poison of this serpent's reptilian wickedness is. Let us go on to the rest once more, to finish the entire work in God.

Against Collyridians,[1] *who make offerings to Mary. 59, but 79 of the series*

1,1 < Another > sect has come to public notice after this, and I have already mentioned a few things about it in the Sect preceding, in the letter about Mary which I wrote to Arabia. (2) This one, again, was also brought to Arabia from Thrace and upper Scythia, and word of it has reached me; it too is ridiculous and, in the opinion of the wise, wholly absurd. (3) < So > let's begin the discussion and description of it; as others like it were, it too will be adjudged silly rather than wise.

1,4 For as, long ago, those who, from an insolent attitude towards Mary, have seen fit to suspect these things were sowing damaging suspicions in people's minds, so these persons who lean in the other direction are guilty of doing the worst sort of harm. In them too the maxim of certain pagan philosophers, "Extremes are equal," will be exemplified. (5) For the harm done by both of these sects is equal, since one belittles the holy Virgin while the other, in its turn, glorifies her to excess.

1,6 And who but women are the teachers of this? Women are unstable, prone to error, and mean-spirited. (7) As in our earlier chapter on Quintilla, Maximilla and Priscilla, so here the devil has seen fit to disgorge ridiculous teachings from the mouths of women. For certain women decorate a barber's chair or a square seat, spread a cloth on it, set out bread and offer it in Mary's name on a certain day of the year, and all partake of the bread–as I partially discussed in my same letter to Arabia. Now, however, I shall speak plainly of it and, with prayer to God, give the best refutations of it that I can, so as to grub out the roots of this idolatrous sect and with God's help, be able to cure certain people of this madness.

2,1 Now then, servants of God, let us adopt a manly frame of mind and dispel the madness of these women. The speculation is entirely feminine, and the malady of the deluded Eve all over again. Or rather, it is still the

[1] The sources of this Sect are oral; see 1,2.

malady of the snake, the seducing beast, and the false promise of the one who spoke in it. This promise made no < sound > suggestion and did not make its undertaking good, but only caused death by calling the untrue true, and encouraging disobedience by the sight of the tree, and aversion to the truth itself by attraction to many things.

2,2 But we shall have reason to suppose that, as the ideas the deceiver sowed by saying, "Ye shall be as gods,"[2] so are the minds of these women which have been ensnared by the pride of that snake. Once again he is bringing death on that sex, as I have often said.

2,3 For to begin with, to whom is it not immediately obvious, < if he will > investigate the whole scope of the past, that their teaching and behavior are devilish, and their undertaking a deviation? Never at any time has a woman offered sacrifice to God—(4) Eve herself, though she had fallen into transgression, still did not dare to undertake such a further impiety. Not one of her daughters did, though Abel sacrificed to God at once, and, even though they were not accepted, Cain offered sacrifices before the Lord. Enoch pleased God and was translated. Noah made thank offerings to the Lord, as a token of gratitude, with the extra animals in the ark, in thanksgiving to the One who had preserved him. (5) The righteous Abraham offered God sacrifice, and Melchizedek the priest of God Most High. Isaac was pleasing to God, and Jacob made the best offering he could on the stone, by pouring oil from his flask.

And the children of Jacob. We find that Levi was the next to receive the priesthood, but that those who received the priestly order came from his stock—I mean Moses the prophet and expositor, Aaron and his sons Eleazar and Phinehas, and his grandson Ithamar. (6) And why name the throngs of those who sacrificed to God in the Old Testament? We find Ahitub sacrificing, and the sons of Korah, and the Gershonites and the Merarites, to whom the levitical order was entrusted. And the house of Eli, and his kinsmen after him in the household of Abimelech and Abiathar, Helkiah and Buzi, down to the high priest Joshua, and Ezra the priest, and the rest And nowhere did a woman offer sacrifice.

3,1 But I shall also go on to the New Testament as well. If it were ordained by God that women should offer sacrifice or have any canonical function in the church, Mary herself, if anyone, should have functioned as a priest in the New Testament. She was counted worthy to bear the king of all in her own womb, the heavenly God, the Son of God. Her womb

[2] Gen 3:5.

became a temple, and by God's kindness and an awesome mystery was prepared to be the dwelling place of the Lord's human nature. But it was not God's pleasure [that she be a priest]. (2) She was not even entrusted with the administration of baptism—for Christ could have been baptized by her rather than by John. But John the son of Zacharias dwelt in the wilderness entrusted with baptism for the remission of sins, while his father offered sacrifice to God and saw a vision at the time of the offering of incense.

3,3 Peter and Andrew, James and John, Philip and Bartholomew, Thomas, Thaddaeus, James the son of Alphaeus, Judas the son of James and Simon the Zealot, and Matthias who was chosen to make up the number of the Twelve—all these were chosen to be apostles and "offer the Gospel"[3] < throughout > the world, together with Paul, Barnabas and the rest, and with James, the Lord's brother and the bishop of Jerusalem, [they were chosen] to preside over mysteries.

3,4 Successors to the episcopate and presbyterate in the household of God were appointed by this bishop and these apostles, and nowhere was a woman appointed. (5) Scripture says, "Philip the evangelist had four daughters which did prophesy,"[4] but they were certainly not priests. And "Anna the daughter of Phanuel was a prophetess,"[5] but not entrusted with the priesthood. For the words, "Your sons shall prophesy, and your daughters shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions,"[6] required fulfillment.

3,6 < It is plain > too that there is an order of deaconesses in the church. But this is not allowed for the practice of priesthood or any liturgical function, but for the sake of female modesty, at either the time of baptism or of the examination of some condition or trouble, and when a woman's body may be bared, so that she will be seen not by the male priests but by the assisting female who is appointed by the priest for the occasion, to take temporary care of the woman who needs it at the time when her body is uncovered. For the ordinance of discipline and good order in the church has been well protected with understanding, by the standard of our rule. For the same reason the word of God does not allow a woman

[3] Rom 15:16.
[4] Acts 21:9.
[5] Luke 2:35.
[6] Joel 3:1; Acts 2:17.

"to speak"[7] in church either, or "bear rule over a man."[8] And there is a great deal that can be said about this.

4,1 But it must be observed that the ordinance of the church required not only deaconesses. It mentioned widows too, and called those of them who were still older, "elder," but nowhere did it prescribe "eldresses" or "priestesses." Indeed, not even the deacons in the hierarchy of the church have been commissioned to celebrate any mystery, but only to administer mysteries already celebrated. (2) But, once more, from whence has this new story arisen for us? Whence women's pride and female madness? What has nourished the wickedness that—through the female, once more![9]— pours the feminine habit of speculation into our minds < and >, by encouraging its characteristic luxury, tries to compel the wretched human race to overstep its proper bounds?

4,3 But let us adopt the firm resolve of the champion Job, prepare ourselves with the righteous answer on our lips, and ourselves say, "Thou hast spoken as one of the foolish women."[10] (4) For how can such a thing not appear insane to every wise man whose <mind is sound*> in God? How can the practice not seem idolatrous and the undertaking the devil's? But the devil has always slipped into the human mind in the guise of someone righteous and, to deify mortal human nature in human eyes, made human images with a great variety of arts. (5) And yet the men who are worshiped have died, and their images, which have never lived, are introduced for worship—and since they've never lived they can't be called dead either! And with adulterous intent < they have rebelled > against the one and only God, like a common whore who has been excited to the wickedness of many relations and rejected the temperate course of lawful marriage to one husband.

4,6 Yes, of course Mary's body was holy, but she was not God. Yes, the Virgin was indeed a virgin and honored as such, but she was not given us to worship; she worships Him who, though born of her flesh, has come from heaven, from the bosom of his Father. (7) And the Gospel therefore protects us by telling us so on the occasion when the Lord himself said, "Woman, what is between me and thee? Mine hour is not yet come."[11] < For > to make sure that no one would suppose, because of the words,

---

[7] 1 Tim 2:12.
[8] 1 Tim 2:12.
[9] πάλιν θήλεος. Eltester suggests that this is corrupt.
[10] Job 2:10.
[11] John 2:4.

"What is between me and thee?" that the holy Virgin is anything more [than a woman], he called her "Woman" as if by prophecy, because of the schisms and sects that were to appear on earth. Otherwise some might stumble into the nonsense of the sect from excessive awe of the saint.

5,1 For what this sect has to say is complete nonsense and, as it were, an old wives' tale. Which scripture has spoken of it? Which prophet permitted the worship of a man, let alone a woman? (2) The vessel is choice but a woman, and by nature no different [from others]. Like the bodies of the saints, however, she has been held in honor for her character and understanding. And if I should say anything more in her praise, [she is] like Elijah, who was virgin from his mother's womb, always remained so, and was taken up and has not seen death. She is like John who leaned on the Lord's breast, "the disciple whom Jesus loved."[12] She is like St. Thecla; and Mary is still more honored than she, because of the providence vouchsafed her. (3) But Elijah is not to be worshiped, even though he is alive. And John is not to be worshiped, even though by his own prayer—or rather, by receiving the grace from God—he made an awesome thing of his falling asleep.[13] But neither is Thecla worshiped, nor any of the saints.

For the age-old error of forgetting the living God and worshiping his creatures will not get the better of me. (4) They served and worshiped the creature more than the creator," and "were made fools."[14] If it is not his will that angels be worshiped, how much more the woman born of Ann,[15] who was given to Ann by Joachim[16] and granted to her father and mother by promise, after prayer and all diligence? She was surely not born other than normally, but of a man's seed and a woman's womb like everyone else. (5) For even though the story and traditions of Mary say that her father Joachim was told in the wilderness, "Your wife has conceived,"[17] it was not because this had come about without conjugal intercourse or a man's seed. The angel who was sent to him predicted the coming event, so that there would be no doubt. The thing had truly happened, had already been decreed by God, and had been promised to the righteous.

---

[12] John 13:23.
[13] Cf. Act. John 108–115.
[14] Rom 1:25; 22.
[15] Cf. Protevangelium of James 4.1–3.
[16] Cf. Protevangelium of James 4.1–3.
[17] Cf. Protevangelium of James 4.2.

6,1 And everywhere we see the scriptures saying < the same >. Isaiah predicted the things that would be realized in the Son of God and said, "Behold, the virgin shall be with child and shall bear a son and shall call his name Immanuel."[18] (2) And as the woman who bore him was a virgin, and the name of < the > child the woman had conceived meant, "God is with us," the prophet saw them in a vision and was compelled by the Holy Spirit to describe them, so that he would not doubt the meaning of the truth. He said, "And he went in unto the prophetess." He was describing Gabriel's entrance in the Gospel, who was sent by God to announce the entrance into the world of God's only-begotten Son, and his birth of Mary. And Isaiah said, "And she conceived and bare a son. (3) And the Lord said unto me, Call his name Spoil Speedily, Ravage Fiercely. For before the child shall know how to cry Father, or Mother, he shall take the power of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria,"[19] and so on.

And all of these things were still unfulfilled. But this would be realized in the Son of God, and fulfilled about 1600 years later. (sic) (4) And the prophet was seeing what would < happen > after so many generations as though it had already happened.

Was it a lie, then? Never! God's providence was announced with confidence as though it had already taken place, so that the truth would not be disbelieved, and the arrival of such an astounding, awesome event would not come to seem uncertain in the prophet's estimation.

6,5 Or don't you see the very next declaration, as the holy Isaiah himself says, "He was led as a sheep to the slaughter, and as a lamb before its shearer is dumb, so opens he not his mouth. But who can tell his generation? For his life is taken from the earth, and I shall give the evil for his grave,"[20] and so on. And see how he describes the earlier events as though they came later, and explains the later ones as though they had already taken place, by saying, "He *was* led as a sheep to the slaughter." (6) For this is said to be a past event; he didn't say, "*is* led," and the subject of Isaiah's pronouncement had yet to be led. But this was said to the prophet as though it had already happened. God's revelation was unalterable.

But when he went on he no longer spoke as of past events, so as not to cause an error in his own turn, but said, "His life is taken from the earth."

---

[18] Isa 7:14.
[19] Isa 8:3–4.
[20] Isa 53:7; 8; 9.

He is giving the truth in the two ways, because "was led" was already done, and "is taken" was done later. Thus from its pastness you will know the truth and the sureness of God's promise, and from its futurity you will imagine the time of the mysteries' revelation.

7,1 And so in Mary's case. The angel foretold what her father would receive from God on his return home—the favor her father and mother had asked in prayer, "Lo, thy wife hath conceived in her womb,"[21] as a sure fulfillment, by the promise, of the faithful man's purpose. But for some this became an occasion of error. No one in the world can be born in any but the normal human way. Only < the Son* > was fit < for this* >; nature allowed it to him alone. (2) As Maker and Master of the thing [to be made] he formed himself from a virgin as though from earth—God come from heaven, the Word who had assumed flesh from a holy Virgin.

But certainly not from a virgin who is worshiped, or to make her God, or to have us make offerings in her name, or, again, to make women priestesses after so many generations. (3) It was not God's pleasure that this be done with Salome, or with Mary herself. He did not permit her to administer baptism or bless disciples, or tell her to rule on earth, but only to be a sacred shrine and be deemed worthy of his kingdom. (4) He did not order the woman called the mother of Rufus to advance < to* > this rank[22] or the women who followed Christ from Galilee, or Martha the sister of Lazarus and [her sister] Mary, or any of the holy women who were privileged to be saved by his advent < and > who assisted him with their own possessions—or the woman of Canaan, or the woman who was healed of the issue of blood, or any woman on earth.

7,5 Again, where has this coiled serpent come from? How are its crooked counsels renewed? Mary should be honored, but the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit should be worshiped; no one should worship Mary. There is no commandment to < offer > the Eucharist even to a man, < as though > to God, let alone to a woman; not even angels are allowed such glory. (6) The bad writing on the hearts of the deluded should be erased, the sliver removed from their eyes. The creature must return to its Master; Eve, with Adam, must take care to honor only God, and not be influenced by the voice of the serpent but abide by God's commandment,

---

[21] Protevangelium of James Codex B 4.2.

[22] Holl <εἰς τοῦτο> προάγειν, MSS τοῦτο ποιεῖν.

"Thou shalt not eat of the tree."[23] (7) And yet the tree was not error; the disobedience of error came by the tree. Let no one eat of the error which has arisen on St. Mary's account. Even though the tree is "lovely"[24] it is not for food; and even though Mary is all fair, and is holy and held in honor, she is not to be worshiped.

8,1 But again, these women are "renewing the potion for Fortune and preparing the table for the demon[25] and not for God, as the scripture says. And they drink impious drinks as the word of God says, "And the women grind flour, and their sons gather wood to make cakes for the host of heaven."[26] (2) Such women should be silenced by Jeremiah, and not frighten the world. They must not say, "We honor the queen of heaven."[27] Taphnes knows how they must be punished; the places in Magdula know how to receive their bodies for the moth. Do not obey a woman, Israel; rise above a woman's evil counsel. "A woman snares men's precious souls."[28] "Her feet bring those who use her with death to hades."[29] (3) "Heed not a worthless woman. Honey drops from the lips of an harlot, who anointeth thy throat for a time; but afterwards shall thou find her more bitter than gall, and sharper than a two-edged sword."[30]

Do not obey this worthless woman. Every sect is a worthless woman, but this sect more so, which is composed of women and belongs to him who was the deceiver of the first woman. (4) Our mother Eve should be honored because formed by God, but not be obeyed, or she may convince her children to eat of the tree and transgress the commandment. She herself must repent of her folly, must turn in shame and clad with fig leaves. And Adam should look to himself, and no longer obey her. (5) Error's persuasion, and the contrary counsels of a woman, are the cause of her spouse's death—and not only his, but her children's. By her transgression Eve has overthrown creation, for she was incited by the voice and promise of the snake, strayed from God's injunction, and went on to another notion.

---

[23] Gen 2:17.
[24] Gen 2:9.
[25] Isa 65:11.
[26] Jer 7:18.
[27] Jer 51:18.
[28] Prov 6:26.
[29] Prov 5:5.
[30] Prov 5:3–4.

9,1 And so, since "death < had entered into > the world"[31] through a woman, the Master and Savior of all, whose desire was to heal the hurt, rebuild the ruins, and repair what was defective, came down and was himself born of a virgin woman to bar death out, complete what was missing, and perfect what was lacking. But evil returns to us, to perpetuate the defect in the world. Thanks to their God-given prudence, however, neither young men nor old obey the woman. (2) The Egyptian woman could not persuade or pervert the chaste Joseph, though she engineered her dire scheme against the boy with great ingenuity. But a man who had received prudence from the Holy Spirit was not persuaded, and so as not to cheapen his nobility did not lose his chastity; he left his garments behind and did not ruin his body. To avoid the snare, he fled the place. He was punished for a while, but he reigns forever. He was thrown into prison, but better to remain under guard and "in the corner of a courtyard"[32] than with "a contentious and brawling woman."[33] (3) And how much is there to say? Whether these worthless women offer Mary the loaf as though in worship of her, or whether they mean to offer this rotten fruit on her behalf, it is altogether silly and heretical, and demon-inspired insolence and imposture.

9,4 But what I have said will do me, so as not to prolong the work. Mary is to be held in honor, but the Lord is to be worshiped! For the righteous deceive no one. "God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man"[34] to deceive him, and neither do his servants. "But every man is tempted of his own lust, and enticed and caught. Then lust conceiveth sin, and sin, when it is perfected, bringeth forth death."[35]

9,5 I believe I have said enough about all this, beloved. Now that we have squashed this blister-beetle too, as it were, with the speech of the truth—it looks golden, has something like wings, and flies, but it is poisonous and contains deadly venom—let us go on to the one sect still remaining. Once more let us call on God's support, so that we may find our way to the realm of the truth, and complete the refutation of our opponents.

---

[31] Rom 5:12.
[32] Prov 21:9.
[33] Prov 21:19.
[34] James 1:13.
[35] James 1:14–15.

Against Massalians,[1] with whom Martyrians, who are pagan, and the Euphemites and Satanians, are associated. 60, but 80 of the series

1,1 Shamelessness never gets enough, and foolishness is never satisfied. Rather, it has bared its mind and opened its mouth to everything, to ruin the seed of Adam and Noah by bringing their chastity to an end by any number of methods, implanting whorishness in its victims by a variety of methods. (2) For another sect has actually arisen after these, a foolish, entirely stupid one, wholly ridiculous, inconsistent in its doctrine, and composed of deluded men and women. They are called Massalians, which means "people who pray."[2]

1,3 For there were others a while ago in their own turn—from about the time of Constantius—who were called Euphemites and Massalians, and I suppose this [present] group has acquired its fervor in imitation of that one. (4) But those were pagan, and neither adherents of Judaism, Christians, nor Samaritans. They were simply pagans, if you please, and said that the gods existed although they worshiped none < of them >, supposedly giving divine honor to one only and calling him the Almighty.[3] They built certain houses for themselves, or flat places like fora, and called these prayer houses.

1,5 There were also places of prayer outside the cities in ancient times, among both the Jews and the Samaritans. I have found this in the Acts of the Apostles where Lydia the seller of purple met St Paul. The sacred scripture describes it as follows: "It seemed to be a place of prayer";[4] and the apostles came up and taught the women who had assembled on that occasion. (6) There is also a place of prayer at Shechem, the town now called Neapolis, about two miles out of town on the plain. It has been set up theater fashion outdoors in the open air, by the Samaritans who mimic all the customs of the Jews.

2,1 But the earlier, pagan Massalians—the predecessors of the present ones whose background is nominally Christian—would sometimes set up small sites like these themselves, like the ones called synagogues and oratories, in certain places; but in others they actually built something

---

[1] 8,1 suggests that Epiphanius' sources of information about this group were oral. Other ancient accounts of the Christian Massalians are found at Ephrem Syrus Haer. 22; Theod. H.E. 4.11; Haer. Fab. 4.11.

[2] מצלינא, from Aramaic צלי, "pray".

[3] Gregory of Nazianzus appears to describe this group under the name of Hypsistarii, Or. 8.5.

[4] Acts 16:13.

like a church. They would gather in the evening and at dawn with much lighting of lamps and torches (2) and offer God lengthy hymns by their sages and certain blessings, if you please, in the fond belief that they can appease God, as it were, < with > hymns and blessings.

2,3 But blind ignorance contrives all this, with the fancy of conceit, for those who have gone astray. (3) One such structure was struck by lightning a while ago, I cannot say where, but I may have heard of it in Phoenicia. Moreover, some zealous provincial governors have put many of these persons to death for debasing the truth and counterfeiting the customs of the church without being either Christians or Jews. I believe the general Lupician was one who punished these pagan Euphemites, but a second error arose for them because of this. (4) Some of them took the bodies of those who were put to death at that time for this pagan lawlessness, buried them in certain places, pronounced the same blessings there in turn, and called themselves Martyrians, supposedly because of those who had been martyred for the idols!

3,1 But others in their own turn thought of something still more crafty and said, as though, in their simplicity, consulting their own intelligence, "Satan is great and the strongest, and does people a great deal of harm. Why not take refuge in him, worship him instead [of God], and give him honor and blessing, so that < he will be appeased* > by our flattering service and do us no harm, but spare us because we have become his servants?" And so, again, they have called themselves Satanians.

3,2 I grouped their sect together with the ones I mentioned first and intend to speak of now because, in their departure from the truth, they do the same things in the open air, and spend their time in prayer and hymns. (3) But all this was harmless because of its absurdity and could distract no one's mind from the truth, for those people were not said to be Christian but were altogether pagan. Today, however, these people who are now called Massalians < have adopted* > their customs. But they have no beginning or end, no top or bottom, they are unstable in every way, without principles, and victims of delusion. They are entirely without the foundation of a name, a law, a position, or legislation.

3,4 Saying that they have supposedly come to faith in Christ, they see fit < to gather* > [in mixed companies] of men and women, as though they had renounced the world and abandoned their homes. But in the summertime they sleep in the public squares, all together in a mixed crowd, men with women and women with men, because, as they say, they own no possession on earth. They show no restraint and hold their hands out to beg, as though they had no means of livelihood and no property.

3,5 But the things they say go beyond foolishness. Whichever of them you ask, he calls himself anything you want him to. If you say, "prophet," they will say, "I am a prophet," if you name Christ, he will say, "I am Christ," if you mention patriarch, he will shamelessly call himself that; if angel, he will say he is one. And in a word, how foolish people are![5]

3,6 They have no notion of fasting.[6] If they get hungry at their time of prayer, if you please, whether it is at the second hour or the third hour or nighttime, they do anything without restraint, and eat and drink. (7) As to vice or sexual misconduct, I have no way of knowing. But they can have no lack of this either, especially with their custom of sleeping all together in the same place, men and women. There are also Massalians, of Mesopotamian extraction, in Antioch.

4,1 But they got this harmful doctrine from the extreme simplicity of certain of the brethren. For some who are brothers of mine, and orthodox, do not know the moderation of Christian conduct, which tells us to renounce the world, abandon our possessions and property, sell what we have and give to the poor—but really to take up the cross and follow, and not < be > idle and without occupation and eat at the wrong times, and not < be like > drones (2) but "work with one's own hands,"[7] like the holy apostle Paul who renounced the world. Though he was the herald of the truth "his hands sufficed not only for himself, but also for them that were with him."[8] Not that they were idle; they joined him in his work. He boasts of this somewhere and teaches us in the plainest of terms, "He that worketh not, neither let him eat."[9] (3) Some of these brethren < refrain from all mundane labor* >—as though they had learned this from the Persian immigrant, Mani, if I may say so. They have no business to be that way. The word of God tells us to mark such people, who will not work.

4,4 For the saying of the Savior, "Labor not for the meat that perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life,"[10] has given some a wrong notion. They believe that "the meat that perishes" is the honest labor < by > which we possess its product righteously. This applied to Abraham's work, because of the calf; to the widow's, because of Elijah; to Job's work because of his sons and cattle; and [it applies] to all these servants of

---

[5] Lietzmann comments, "Dies wird wohl eine karrikierte Aüsserungsweise des bei Theodoret bezeugten Enthusiasmus = Einwirking des heiligen Geistes sein."

[6] Cf. Theod. H. E. 4.11.7.

[7] Cf. 1 Cor. 4:12; 1 Thes. 4:11.

[8] Cf. Acts 20:34.

[9] 2 Thes 3:10.

[10] John 6:27.

God who labor righteously with their own hands "to suffice also for them that need"[11]—just as they perform this righteous labor in every monastery, in Egypt and every country. (5) As the bee, with the wax she has produced < in > her hands but a drop of honey in her mouth, hymns the Lord of all with her own voice of song, in proportion to her understanding—as Solomon testifies, "By honoring wisdom she was advanced"[12]—(6) so the servants of God who are truly founded on the solid rock of the truth and build their house securely, perform their light tasks, each in his own trade, with their own hands. And they recite nearly all of the sacred scripture and keep their frequent vigils without tiring or grudging, one in prayer, another in psalmody. They continually hold the assemblies that have been set by lawful custom, (7) and spend all their days in the offering of blameless prayers to God, with deep humility and woeful lamentation, < at > the hours which come without intermission at their fixed intervals. [And], as I said, besides their spiritual work they spend their days in manual labor, so that they will not become needy and fall into human hypocrisies, no longer able to speak the truth to the impious (8) or be untouched by the defilement of those who are rich from unrighteousness and take advantage of the poor—and no longer able to do without maintenance by such people because they cannot support themselves by honest toil, but are forced by need to share the idle table of the rich.

5,1 And thus the word of God urges us, "Desire not the meats of the rich, for these are near a life of falsehood."[13] And again, in another passage, "Such things must thou prepare. But if thou art more greedy, desire not his meats."[14] (2) For the [three] children in Babylon gained glory from these, because they rejected the king's table and chose to satisfy their hunger with seeds instead of his table and food. They renounced wealth and glory as Moses "chose rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy"[15] the treasures in Egypt.

But he attained to prophecy by working with his own hands. (3) For this aristocrat and son of the king's daughter was made a shepherd so that he would not eat the bread of idleness. And so our father Jacob teaches us this when he says to Laban, "Give me work, so that I may labor <and

[11] Cf. Eph 4:28.
[12] Prov 6:8c.
[13] Prov 23:3.
[14] Prov 23:2–3.
[15] Heb 11:25.

enjoy > mine own bread."[16] And Jacob himself in his turn was told by his own father-in-law to tend sheep, for the righteous must not eat the bread of idleness.

5,4 The apostles were told to earn their living by preaching the word, so that they would not spend their time in journeys from city to city and place to place to preach. For "The laborer is worthy of his hire,"[17] and, "Sufficient for him that laboreth is his sustenance."[18] (5) And because of their frequent business with the laity, their administration of the church, and their constant liturgical worship, the word of God also says to pastors, "Who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of its milk? Or who planteth a vineyard, and partaketh not of its fruit?"[19] It says besides, "The husbandman must be first partaker of the fruits,"[20] (6) so as not to leave the presbyter or bishop in want of his daily bread; it urges the laity to contribute from their just wages to the support of the priests, through firstfruits, offerings and the rest. And though the persons God has appointed to guide the laity have a right to these things, since they profess to please God wholly they do not use them to excess.

6,1 Indeed, besides their preaching of the word, some of God's priests imitate their holy father in Christ after God, I mean the holy apostle Paul, and most, though not all, work with their hands as far as possible and < ply > any trade they find to be in keeping with their rank and constant care for the church. (2) Thus, along with the word and its preaching, they will have a clear conscience because they produce with their own hands, maintain themselves and, with an excellent disposition towards God and their neighbors, willingly share the alms they have on hand, I mean < from > firstfruits, offerings and their own earnings, with the brethren and the needy.

6,3 True, they are under no compulsion [to do this], or condemned [for not doing it]; but even though they are engaged [both] in righteous labor and in the work of the church, and have a right to maintenance, they do this from an abundance of good will. (4) For their God-inspired souls also desire this, grounded, [as they are], in the fear of God, and taught by the Holy Spirit of the heavenly riches, which are righteously gained amid praise, a good report and excellence, and are won by sacred doctrines, the study of the holy scripture and the oracles of God, psalmody and solemn

16 Cf. Gen 29:15–16.
17 Matt 10:10.
18 Cf. 1 Tim 6:8.
19 1 Cor 9:7.
20 2 Tim 2:6.

assemblies, holy fasts, purity and discipline, and voluntary manual work for righteousness' sake.

6,5 Besides, these same esteemed brethren of ours in the monasteries, or, as we say, the cloisters of Mesopotamia, have been detected in another form [of error], that of deliberately < having > their hair long like a woman's and wearing sackcloth openly. (6) The children of < Christ's > holy virgin, our mother the church, should be grave and retiring persons and secretly serve the God who, as the scripture says, knows our secrets and rewards us openly. They should < walk > decorously because of outsiders, and not desire reward and credit from those who see them. Visible sackcloth is out of place in the catholic church, as is < un >cut hair, because of the apostle's injunction, "A man ought not to have long hair, inasmuch as he is the image of God."[21]

7,1 But what is worse, and the opposite error, some cut off their beards, the mark of manhood, while often letting the hair of their heads grow long. And as to the beard, the sacred instruction and teaching in the Ordinances of the Apostles says not to "spoil," that is, not to cut the beard,[22] and not to deck oneself with meretricious ornaments or have the approach of pride as a copy of righteousness. (2) Long hair was proper only for nazirites, because of the type. The ancients were guided by the type of Him who was to come, and had long hair on their heads for prayer until the world's Prayer came and was answered. But Christ, God's only-begotten Son, was obviously a Head; and he who always was, was made known to the world—(and yet was not known to all mankind, but only to the few believers in him)—so that, when we know the Head, we will not "dishonor the head."[23] This dishonor is not praiseworthy like the other one <of which the scripture speaks> when it says, "despising the shame."[24] (3) For the apostle is not speaking of his own head; the point of his joke, "Doth not nature itself teach you that, if a man hath long hair, it is shame to *Him*?"[25] applies to Christ rather than to Paul's head. For the adornment is not [being worn] for God's sake, even though it is supposed to be; the style is a contentious one, since the type of the Law is gone and the truth has come.

7,4 But Paul says, "If any seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God."[26] He rejected persons who had such

---

[21] 1 Cor 11:7.
[22] Didascalia 2 (S-S p. 107; A-F p. 5).
[23] 1 Cor 11:4.
[24] Heb 12:2.
[25] Cf. 1 Cor 11:14.
[26] 1 Cor 11:16.

customs and practices because, by the apostles' ordinance and in the eyes of God's church, they are contentious. (5) But I have been obliged to say this because of these Massalians, since they have contracted the sickness of mind from the same source (i.e., contention), have truly come to grief from perversity of mind, and have been made a sect with the horrid custom of idleness and the other evils.

8,1 This is what I have heard about these people in their turn. They have become a joke in the eyes of the world and have spat up their vulgar thought and words, though they are incoherent and irremediable, and have abandoned God's building. So I shall mention a few points about these things and, as usual, work them up for their refutation. (2) First of all, by the ancient usage of persons who are really married, right reason does not allow women to associate with men. [It allows] a man < to be > with his wife in private, as Adam was with Eve, as Sarah was with Abraham, as Rebecca was united with Isaac. (3) For even though some of the patriarchs had two and three wives, the wives were not in one house. This sort of thing is the intercourse of swine and cattle. (4) If anything, these people astonish me because they profess not to have commerce with wives, while on the contrary they are having their joke and making a show of their utter shame. (5) For even if they had spouses, they should have them individually, not promiscuously. And even if they are married, they should not be caught making a public spectacle, by their own free choice, of God's institution, the union of man and wife with decency, dignity and understanding. (6) Even though some of them have abstained from women in purity and continence, they have outraged what is right by their foolishness, and virtuous behavior by their silly, extravagant activity—for the apostles did not do this, nor did the prophets who preceded the apostles command it.

9,1 Moses took up the hymnody in the wilderness when he came out of the sea, and sang to God, "Let us sing to the Lord, for he is held in glorious honor; horse and rider hath he thrown into the sea."[27] And the men responded together, but no women, to show their decorous dispositions, teaching the dignity and order of God's Law. (2) And next it says, "And Miriam took the timbrel and led the women, and said, "Let us sing to the Lord, for he is held in glorious honor."[28] And women responded together to her who was like them, was of the same sex, and was in some

[27] Exod 15:1.
[28] Exod 15:20–21.

sort their leader—contrary to the ignorant, vulgar notion of those who practice heresies in mixed crowds.

9,3 But the prophet says of the resurrection, "And they shall mourn by tribes, the tribe of Nathan by itself and their women by themselves, the tribe of Judah by itself and their women by themselves,"[29] and so on. (4) The apostles enjoined this on the church, and the Lord enjoined it in the Gospel by illustrating it from one woman and telling his mother (sic), "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father."[30] (5) So Gehazi approached the Shunamite to thrust her away, to keep her from violating the commandment and flaunting the ordinance of the prophets. But by the Holy Spirit's inspiration the prophet saw the woman's sadness, transgressed the ordinance to console her, received her that one time for the woman's consolation, and overlooked her touching his feet contrary to custom < because of > her distress and grief of heart. And why should I say a lot about these people who mimic dogs and imitate swine?

9,6 But as to their calling themselves Christ, what sensible person can fail to see that the doctrine is crazy? Or < their > saying, "I am a prophet!" What kind of prophecy is to be seen among them, or which marvelous work of Christ do they perform? If someone is Christ himself, in which Lord has he hoped and believed? Why the errant nonsense? Why the idiotic doctrines? But the things I have said about it will also be sufficient for this sect.

10,1 And this is the place to seal my whole work on these sects and bring it to a close. God has appeared and come to my aid, as I can confess with all my soul and mind, < and > thank the Lord himself that I have been privileged to finish the undertaking I assumed in the Lord himself—I mean that I have composed a description and refutation of < eighty > sects, and at the same time, as far as my human frailty permitted, revealed what goes on in each. (2) For this is the end of my full account of the origins and causes of the eighty sects I have been told of, and whose number and names I know, and the formularies, proof-texts and positions of some of them. I am struck with wonder at the words of the sacred scripture, "There are threescore queens and fourscore concubines, and maidens without number; one is my dove, my perfect one,"[31] to see how—(3) after speaking of the eighty concubines to begin with and naming Barbarism, Scythianism, Judaism, Samaritanism [and the rest], which are not lawful wives

[29] Zech 12:12.
[30] John 20:17.
[31] Cant 6:8–9.

and have no dowry from the king and no guarantee that their children can inherit—all I shall have left is the demonstration of the truth, the one and only dove herself, whom the bridegroom praises.[32] (4) (For there really are seventy-five concubines, and these five mothers of theirs—Hellenism, the mother of the pagans; Judaism, the mother of the Jews; the Samaritan sect, the mother of the Samaritans, and Christianity,[33] (5) from which the separated sects have been broken off like branches and are called by Christ's name but are not his. Some are very far removed from him, while others have disinherited and estranged themselves over some very small matter—[themselves] and their children, who are not children of lawful wives but of wives who have strayed, and are merely called by the name of Christ.)

11,1 And in what follows, now that I have the leisure and have made fervent supplication to God, I shall make the case for the truth, brief in its statement but sure in its teaching. Though the truth is not last; it is first, and I have already mentioned it some time ago, before the sects, in the Advent of Christ.[34] (2) < I sing its praises* > now, however, because it is the first, and ever since his incarnation has been united to Christ as his holy bride. (3) It was created with Adam, proclaimed among the patriarchs before Abraham, believed with Abraham, revealed by Moses, and prophesied in Isaiah. But it was made manifest in Christ and exists with Christ, and is the object of our praise after< wards >.

11,4 For to receive the crown afterwards and continue happy with the crown, the contestant must first engage in the contest, and the toil and other struggles of the contest. Not that the crown comes last; it is there before the bout but is awarded afterwards, for the joy and gladness of him who has worked for it. (5) But now that I have said these things about the Massalians, let us go on to the words I have spoken of, < because we want > to show how there are eighty concubines but sixty queens, (6) [and] how one is at once virgin and holy bride, and dove and ewe lamb, but [also] God's holy city, "the pillar and ground of the truth"[35] and "the firm rock, over which the gates of hell shall not prevail."[36]

---

[32] This last clause is Holl's paragraph 6. It follows a very long parenthesis in the text, and the sense is best conveyed by rendering it here.

[33] Without Barbarism and Scythianism, which Epiphanius omits here, there are 79 sects; with them, if Christianity is also to be counted, there are 81.

[34] *De Incarnatione,* the unnumbered tractate between Sects 20 and 21.

[35] 1 Tim 2:15.

[36] Matt 16:18.

(7) For, calling and having called upon God in all things, I have succeeded in keeping my promised undertaking, I mean the complete heresiology, and in this undertaking reached even the sect of the Massalians. Treading on it too with the shoe of the Gospel, like a many-footed, ugly, misshapen and foul-smelling chameleon, let us give thanks to God in all things and < glorify > the Father in the Son, the Son in the Father, with the Holy Spirit, forever and ever. Amen.

A Concise, Accurate Account of the Faith of the Catholic and Apostolic Church (De Fide)

1,1 We have discussed the various, multiform, much divided, rash teachings of the crooked counsels of our opponents, have distinguished them by species and genus, and, by God's power, have exposed them as stale and worthless. We have sailed across the shoreless sea of the blasphemies of each sect, with great difficulty crossed the ocean of their blasphemous, shameful, repulsive mysteries, (2) given the solutions to their < hosts > of problems, and passed their wickedness by. And we have approached the calm lands of the truth, after negotiating every rough place, enduring every squall, foaming, and tossing of billows, (3) and, as it were, seeing the swell of the sea, and its whirlpools, its shallows none too small, and its places full of dangerous beasts, and experiencing them through their words.

And now, sighting the haven of peace, we make supplication to the Lord once more in prayer as we hasten to land in it. (4) Now, as we recover from all our fear, distress and illness, as we inhale the mainland breezes with the utmost relief, as we < have come to > safety and[1] won our way to the calm harbor, we rejoice already in our spirits. (5) If the truth must be told, we have borne many hardships in [all of] this, and no light ill treatment, and have marched and sailed, as it were, across land and sea—the earth's rugged mountains and desert wastes, and the perils of the deep which we have mentioned. (6) Let us hasten to the city the moment we spy it—the holy Jerusalem and Christ's virgin and bride, the firm foundation and rock, our holy mother < but > Christ's bride. At this most auspicious moment let us ourselves say, "Come, let us go up to the

[1] Dummer καλοῦ τε, Holl [καὶ] τοῦ τε.

mountain of the Lord, and the house of the God of Jacob. And he shall teach us his way,"[2] and so on.

2,1 Now then, children of Christ and sons of God's holy church, who have read through this compilation of the eighty sects or a part of them, who have joined me in plowing through such a mass of their wicked doctrines and marching across such a vast desert, fearful and dryly set down! (2) As though we were in Mara and thirsty from the fearful, trackless waste, let us call upon the Lord of all, for we have always been in need of him and in every part of these Sects, in our continual encounters with their obscurities. (3) Let us cry out ourselves, "Like as the hart desireth the waterbrooks, so longeth my soul after thee, O God," and again, "When shall I come to appear before the presence of God?"[3] (4) Therefore let us ourselves be quick to call upon him—not as he called the bride, for he is her Bridegroom, Lord, Master, King, God and Champion. (5) But let us call upon him as his servants and ourselves say, in unison with him, "Hither from Lebanon, O bride, for thou art all fair and there is no spot in thee."[4]

2,6 [She is] the great Builder's garden, the city of the holy king, the bride of the unspotted Christ, the pure virgin betrothed in faith to one husband alone—she who is illustrious and "breaketh forth as the dawn, fair as the moon, choice as the sun, terrible as serried ranks;"[5] she who is called blessed by the "queens," and hymned by the "concubines."[6] She is praised by the daughters and "cometh from the wilderness,"[7] "made white and leaning upon her sister's son."[8] She exudes myrrh and "cometh from the wilderness, exuding, like pillars of smoke, myrrh, and frankincense from the powders of the perfumer"[9] who has given his own sweet savor—(7) he whom she foresaw and said, "Ointment poured out is thy name; therefore the maidens have loved thee."[10]

She "standeth at the king's right hand clad in fringed garments, cunningly adorned with garments interwoven with gold."[11] There is no dark-

---

[2] Isa 2:3.
[3] Ps 41:2–3.
[4] Cant 4:8; 7.
[5] Cant 6:10.
[6] Cant 6:8.
[7] Cant 3:6.
[8] Cant 8:5.
[9] Cant 3:6.
[10] Cant 1:3.
[11] Ps 44: 10; 14.

ness in her though once she was "blackened."[12] (8) But now she is "fair"[13] and "made white."[14] Thus, on entering you, we shall recover from the hateful pains of the deeds of the sects that once shot through us, shall have respite from the tossing of their billows, and be truly refreshed in you, our holy mother the church, in the sacred doctrine that is in you, and God's sole true faith.

2,9 But I shall begin describing the wonders of this holy city of God. For glorious things have been spoken of her, as the prophet said, "Glorious things have been spoken of thee, O city of God."[15] They are beyond the reach of all and inaccessible to unbelievers, but are obtainable in part, with the promise of fullness, by the faithful and true, [and] will be provided by their Master in the kingdom of heaven, where, with her own heavenly bridegroom, his holy virgin and heiress has herself obtained her portion and inheritance.

3,1 In the first place, the God who is over all is God to us who have been born of this holy church. This is the first proof of the truth, and "the ground of the faith"[16] of this only, virgin, holy and harmless "dove" (2) whom the Lord revealed in the Spirit to Solomon in the Song of Songs and said, "There are threescore queens, and fourscore concubines, and maidens without number, but one is *my* dove, *my* perfect one"[17]— with the addition of "my" and "my." (3) For she is *his* "dove" and *his* "perfect one," since the others are said to be and are not, while she herself is named twice. He did not say, "They are *my* eighty concubines," of the others. He awarded the queens their honorable connection with him through the glorious name; but of the concubines he declared their complete foreignness.

3,4 When I note their numbers I am obliged to investigate the passage by the anagogical method of spiritual interpretation, so as not to pass them by. I am not exaggerating but truly comparing words with their true spiritual senses, by means of the true scriptures. (5) For < it is plain > that the number of each thing in scripture is unalterable, and that nothing which is assigned a number can be without value or be reduced to

[12] Cant 1:6.
[13] Cant 1:5.
[14] Cant 1:5.
[15] Ps 86:3.
[16] Cf. 1 Tim 3:15.
[17] Cant 6:8–9.

number in the scripture for no good reason. Now "queens" are the ones[18] named earlier on in a genealogy. (6) For vast throngs accompany a king, but the king is still their head. So just as one man will be identified by his head although there are many members in a body, the entire throng of the king's subjects will be reckoned as one through the one king.

4,1 Now a generation in Christ is called a "queen," not because the whole generation ruled, but because the one generation which knew the Lord is elevated < to > the royal rank and status by the name of its husband.[19] For example, Adam and his whole generation are to be counted as this, a "queen"—both his rule, and the ruling family which reigned with him—because of his knowledge of God, his privilege of being the first man created, and because he was given the first penance, as the sequel shows. (2) Then after him came Seth and all humankind with him, and Enosh, Cainan, Mahalaleel, Jared, Enoch, Methuselah, Lamech and Noah; these holy men have been listed individually by number, one generation after another, and the number of them is given in Matthew. (3) For in Matthew there are sixty-two generations and lineages, listed under the names of their finest men, who had the knowledge of God or shared the royal glory and dignity because of some other excellence. The roll of the number < of them > goes on until the incarnation of Christ.

4,4 For ten generations passed between Adam and Noah and another ten between Noah and Abraham. But there were fourteen generations from Abraham until David, fourteen generations from David until the captivity, and fourteen generations from the captivity until Christ, so that there are sixty-two generations from Adam to Christ, and they are rounded off to sixty. (5) For although there were seventy-two palm trees in the wilderness, scripture called them seventy. And although the seventy men were called to the mount, with Eldad and Medad they are seventy-two. And there were seventy-two translators under Ptolemy, but to round this off we customarily speak of the Septuagint version.

4,6 Here too, I believe, it says sixty queens with the omission of the first and the last, because of the < suitability of the* > middle sixty for types and an anagogical treatment of the entire subject. For since < the length of

[18] Literally, "souls"; ψυχαί feminine.

[19] γενεά, "generation," is feminine, making the word-play possible. Both the generations and, from Epiphanius' point of view, the sects succeed one another, and both series start with Adam.

time between Adam and Christ is counted* > by six tens,[20] but the time of the creation was correspondingly over in < six days* >, < the number six seems a suitable one* > for the linking of < a throng > of holy souls from every generation, who have reigned in God by faith. (7) Thus there are six stone water jars at Cana of Galilee, which were emptied and filled again. By holding two[21] or three[22] firkins apiece they < symbolize* > the amounts of the Old and New Testaments, and the whole of the Trinity. They were changed from water into unmixed wine, and filled for the good cheer of a wedding and the sons of men. (8) And so the pagan writings speak of a hexagon, which is multiplied to twenty-one by three and seven.[23] The significance of this hexagon is the same as the whole visible vault (of the universe), since its rectangular base has a fourfold < "side" >, as it were, and the covering over the vaulting on top makes six.

5,1 But not to go on too long, I rest content, once more, with what I have said about the sixty queens counted up until Christ's incarnation. But after Christ and until now there are still generations, as is known only to the Lord. (2) No one has reported or arranged the numbers by generation any further, because the number of this sort of thing has been sealed and closed by the number of the queens, which is counted up to the incarnation itself. (3) For the rest, the later authors, rhetoricians, annalists or historians, no longer count generations but successions and times of the emperors, according to the number of the years of each emperor's reign.

From all this the wise will easily understand that, even without this inquiry, all time is divided into the sixty-two generations up until Christ—(4) for after Christ the world's time periods are no longer counted by lineages in this way, since < the number > [of them] is summed up in one unified whole which, by God's good pleasure, indicates an unshakeable stay. This [unity] will make it < evident > that the end of the age is separate from time, and will be over at the transition to the age to come.[24]

---

[20] I.e., groups of ten or more generations, counted by their "heads," the persons who begin them. Epiphanius arrives at the figure, six, by counting Adam as one, and Christ as six. See 4,4.

[21] I.e., the Old and New Testaments.

[22] The Persons of the Holy Trinity.

[23] It is probably best to interpret this simply as the shape of a hexagon resting on one side.

[24] The number which means "unshakeable support" is one. There is one "end of the age," i.e., the time between Christ's incarnation and the beginning of the "age to come." The oneness of the "end of the age" is shown by the fact that its chronology is not reckoned by successive generations, which were multiple.

5,5 This is why he says, "*One* is my dove, my perfect one."[25] All things are completed in her, whether < they are > times and seasons, years and intervals of generations, and whether the age counts its dates by emperors, consuls, Olympiads or governorships. (6) But there are eighty concubines, who were to be found among the queens even before the earthly reign, that is, the reign of the faith and this bride and virgin herself, who is unspotted and a "dove," the "only daughter of her mother, even of her that bore her."[26]

6,1 For the church is engendered by one faith and born with the help of the Holy Spirit, and is the only daughter of the only mother, and the one daughter of her that bore her. And all the women who came after and before her have been called concubines. They have not been entire strangers to the covenant and inheritance, but have no stated dowry and are not receptacles of the Holy Spirit, but have only an illicit union with the Word. (2) For the Hebrew language gave a good explanation of the concubine by calling her "pilegeshtha." "Peleg" means "half," and "ishtha" is a wife, which is as much as to say that she is "half a wife."[27] (3) Insofar as she has come to the Lord, he called all to the light of liberty by saying, "While ye have the light with you, walk in the light."[28] And the holy apostle says, "Ye are children of the day and children of the light."[29] And again < it is said > in the sacred scripture, "He that doeth evil hateth the light neither cometh unto the light."[30] (4) And similarly even though concubines—who are not acknowledged or full wives, and are not married with a dowry by their husbands—have carnal relations with the husbands, they cannot have the honor, title, security, marriage portion, wedding gifts, dowered status and legitimacy of the free wife.

And so, as I have said, the sects I have listed in succession are eighty concubines. (5) But no one need be surprised if each of them is given different names in every country. What is more, we must observe that each sect in turn has frequently divided into many parts on its own and the names [of them] are different. This is no surprise; it is the way things are. (6) But I find eighty-one—one [more than eighty] because of the one who is different from them all, but is the only one allotted to the bride-

---

[25] Cant 6:9.
[26] Cant 6:9.
[27] Epiphanius incorrectly adds the Aramaic emphatic ending to the Hebrew פילגש and אשת.
[28] Cf. John 12:35.
[29] 1 Thes 5:5.
[30] John 3:20.

groom acknowledged by him with such a name as "One is my dove," and again, "my perfect one."[31] In other words all the concubines are low-born and not reckoned as harmless, or pure and gentle.

6,7 There are concubines, then, from < the ones > that followed the so-called "Barbarism" and "Scythianism" in the beginning, down through the Massalians of whom we have just spoken—seventy-seven in all, and the source of the pagan sects, Hellenism, and Judaism, the source of < the > Jewish, and the Samaritan sect, the source of the Samaritan. When < these > three are added to the seventy-seven the sum is eighty and the one is left, (8) namely, the holy catholic church, Christianity. By the will of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit Christianity was, in fact, named from the beginning, both with Adam and—before Adam and before all the ages—with Christ, and was believed by all who have pleased God in every generation. And it was plainly revealed in the world at Christ's coming. And I now sing its praises once more after all these sects, the ones < we called > concubines, following the order of the treatise.

7,1 For the Word himself counted the sects like this in the Song of Songs when he said, "Eighty queens and eighty concubines and maidens without number. But one," he says, "is my dove, my perfect one; the one daughter of her mother, elect for her that bore her."[32] (2) And he later shows how all will find her the most honored of them all, the mistress of them all, and his only choice, the one whose children are the king's heirs and legitimate children. For they are "children of the promise" and not "children of the bondmaid"[33] or the concubine, or of the others whose description is endless.

7,3 For even though Abraham had children by the concubine Keturah, Keturah's children were not joint heirs with Isaac. They received gifts, however, like gifts for a governor, to make sure that the type would be preserved for the anagogical interpretation of the text, and that no one would despair of Christ's calling. (4) For the gifts Abraham gave Ishmael and Keturah's sons were a type of the good things to come, for the conversion of the gentiles to the faith and truth.

7,5 For Abraham gave Hagar, a bondmaid and cast out by Abraham—([she was] like the Jerusalem below who was in bondage with her children, of whom it is said, "I have cast out thy mother,"[34] and again, "I gave the bill

[31] Cant 6:9.
[32] Cant 6:7–8.
[33] Gal 4:28; 31.
[34] Cf. Jer 22:26.

of divorcement into her hands.")[35] Abraham gave this bondmaid, I mean Hagar, a skin full of water, the more of a type because of the hope of her conversion.[36] This was to show the power of the "laver of regeneration,"[37] which has been given to unbelievers for a gift of life, and for the conversion of all the heathen to the knowledge of the truth.

7,6 But Abraham's gifts to Keturah's children were wealth—gold, silver, clothing, and whatever Abraham secretly hid in their wallets, the "frankincense, myrrh and gold"[38] of the companions of the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah, which < had been plundered by > Chedorlaomer's allies. They had taken prisoners from Sodom, Gomorrah and the other towns, had made off with their horses, captured most of the people, and seized the wealth and possessions of each king and the greater part of the others. (7) Abraham brought [all] this back "from the slaughter of the kings"[39] at that time. But he did not dare to return things already reserved for the Lord God and instead, as I find in the traditions of the Hebrews, gave them as gifts, along with his other gifts, to his sons by Keturah.

8,1 These children of Abraham by Keturah were cast out by Abraham, and settled in Magodia in Arabia. The same gifts <were offered> to Christ in Bethlehem < by > the magi who came from their land and, when they had seen the star and come, offered presents and gifts in order to share in the same hope. (2) The prophet gives plain indication of these gifts by saying, "Before the child is able to cry Father or Mother, he shall take the power of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria before the king of the Assyrians."[40] For as I said, these were taken from Damascus in Abraham's time, and from Samaria, by the kings on their raid. (3) Now when did Christ receive them "before he could cry Father of Mother" except when the magi came and "opened their wallets"—or "treasures," as some copies say—"and offered myrrh, frankincense and gold?"[41]

And do you see how the truth's expressions go, and the consequences of them? (4) These sects too are concubines, and their children have received gifts. But the concubines have received only the name, and have only been called by Christ's name and received their few texts from the

---

[35] Jer 3:8.
[36] I.e., Hagar's, "return".
[37] Tit 3:5.
[38] Matt 2:11.
[39] Gen 14:16–17.
[40] Isa 8:4.
[41] Matt 2:11.

sacred scripture, so that, if they choose, they can understand the truth by these. (5) But if they prefer not to, but return to Herod—(for they are told not to return to Herod, but to go to their country by another way.) But if they do not do as they are told the gifts are no good to them, just as their coming would have done the magi no good if they had returned to Herod. For these same sects debase the teachings of God's oracles in a way that resembles Herod's.

9,1 These, then, are < the > eighty concubines, so numbered in scripture. And the individuals listed by generation are those queens, that is, men and patriarchs. But the young girls without number consist of the further philosophies all over the world and the ways of life, one praiseworthy and one not, of each individual. (2) For who can count the variety of this world? How many other sects have not grown up among the Greeks after the four most famous ones which we have mentioned—and further, after those sects and the ones after them, how many individuals and ideas keep arising of themselves, with seeming "youth," in accordance with the opinion of each? (3) There are some called Pyrrhonians, for example, and many others. Since I have learned of many I shall give their names and their opinions in order below, but < this > is a fraction of the ones in the world. (4) And the ones which follow are Greek sects. As the first of them I should begin with the opinion and belief of Thales of Miletus.

9,5 For Thales of Miletus himself, who was one of the seven sages, declared that the primal origin of all things is water. For he says that everything originates from water and is resolved back into water.

9,6 Anaximander the son of Praxiades, also a Milesian, said that the infinite is the first principle of all things. For all things originate from this and all things are resolved into it.

9,7 Anaximenes the son of Eurystatus, also a Milesian, said that air is the first principle of all things, and that everything originates from this.

9,8 Anaxagoras the son of Hegesibulus, of Clazomene, said that identical particles are the first principles of all things.

9,9 Archelaus < the > naturalist, the son of Apollodorus—some say the son of Milton, but he was Athenian—says that all things have originated from earth. For this is the first principle of all things, or so he says.

9,10 Socrates the ethicist, the son of Sophroniscus the statuary[42] and Phaenaretes the midwife, said that man must mind his own affairs but nothing more.

---

[42] Diels ἑρμογλύφου MSS Ελμάγλου, an improbable name.

9,11 Pherecydes too said that earth came into being before all things.

9,12 Pythagoras of Samos, the son of Mnesarchus, said that God is the unit, and that nothing has come into being apart from this. But he said that the wise must not sacrifice animals to the gods, and must certainly not eat meat or beans, or drink wine. He said that everything from the moon down is passible, but that everything above the moon is impassible. And he said that the soul migrates into many animals. He also commanded his disciples to maintain silence for five years, and in the end pronounced himself a god.

9,13 Xenophanes the son of Orthomenus, from Colophon, said that all things are made of earth and water. All things are, or so he said, but nothing is true. Thus what is certain is not clear; all things, especially invisible things, are matters of opinion.

9,14 Parmenides the son of Pyres, an Elean, also said that the infinite is the first principle of all things.

9,15 Zeno of Elea, the controversialist. Like the other Zeno he said both that the earth is immoveable and that there is no void. He also says the following: That which must be moved is moved either in the place in which it is, or the place in which it is not. And it can neither be moved in the place in which it is, nor in the place in which it is not; therefore nothing is moved.

9,16 Melissus the son of Ithagenes, the Samian, said that everything is one, but that it is by not nature enduring; all things are potentially destructible.

9,17 Leucippus the Milesian—though some say that he was an Elean—was also a controversialist. He too said that everything is in the infinite, and that all events take place in imagination and appearance. There are no real events; they are apparent, like an oar in the water.

9,18 Democritus of Abdera, the son of Damasippus, said that the world is infinite and is situated above a void. But he also said that there is one end of all, and that contentment is best, but that pains are the boundaries of evil. And what appears just is not just; the unjust is the opposite of nature. For he said that laws are an evil invention, and < that > the wise should not obey laws, but live freely.

9,19 Metrodorus of Chios said that no one understands anything. We have no precise understanding of the things we think we know; and we should pay no heed to our senses, for all things are appearance.

9,20 Protagoras of Abdera, the son of Menander, said that there are no gods, and that God does not exist at all.

9,21 Diogenes of Smyrna, or some say he was from Cyrene, held the same opinions as Protagoras.

9,22 Pyrrho of Elis collected all the doctrines of the other sages and wrote objections to them to demolish their opinions. He was not satisfied with any doctrine.

9,23 Empedocles of Agrigentum, the son of Meto, introduced fire, earth, water and air as the four primal elements, and said that originally there was enmity between the elements. For earlier they had been separated, he said, but now, as he says, they have been united in friendship. In his opinion, then, there are two first principles and powers, enmity and love, the one of which is unitive, the other, divisive.

9,24 Heraclitus of Ephesus, the son of Bleso, said that all things come from fire and are resolved back into fire.

9,25 Prodicus calls the four elements, and then the sun and the moon, gods; for he said that the vital principle of all things comes from these.

9,26 Plato the Athenian said that there are God, matter and form, but that the world is generate and mortal while the soul is ingenerate, immortal and divine. But there are three parts of the soul, the rational, the spirited, and the appetitive. And he said that marriages and wives should be common to all, and that no one should have one spouse to himself, but that anyone who wishes may have relations with any women who are willing.

9,27 Aristippus of Cyrene. He was gluttonous and pleasure-loving, and said that the pleasure is the goal of the soul, and that whoever experiences pleasure is happy. But one who never experiences pleasure is thrice wretched, as he says, and unfortunate.

9,28 Theodoras, who is called the atheist, said that discussion of God is silly. For he believed that there is nothing divine, and therefore urged everyone to steal, forswear themselves, rob, and not die for their countries. For he said that the world is one country and that only the happy man is good, and that the unfortunate < must > be avoided even if he is wise. And a fool, if he is wealthy and an unbeliever, is preferable [to such a "wise" man].

9,29 Hegesias of Cyrene. This man said that there is no such thing as love or gratitude. They do not exist; one does a favor because he is in need [of a favor], or confers a benefit because he has suffered something worse [by not conferring it]. He also said the following: Life is profitable for a bad man, but death for a good one. Hence some have called him the advocate of death.

9,30 Antisthenes, who had a Thracian mother but was Athenian himself, was first a Socratic and then a Cynic. He said that we must not envy the good deeds of others or their shameful behavior to one another; and that the walls of a city are vulnerable to the traitor within, but the walls of the soul are unshakeable and unbreachable.

9,31 Diogenes the Cynic who was from Sinope in Pontus, agreed with Antisthenes in everything. He said that the good is natural[43] to every wise man but that everything else is simply foolishness.

9,32 Crates of Thebes in Boeotia, also a Cynic, said that poverty is liberty.

9,33 Arcesilaus said that the truth is accessible to God alone, but not to man.

9,34 Carneades was of the same opinion as Arcesilaus.

9,35 Aristotle the son of Nicomachus is said by some to be a Macedonian from Stagyra, but a few say that he was Thracian. He said that there are two first principles, God and matter, and that things above the moon are subject to divine providence, but that what is below the moon is not ruled by providence but borne along at random by some unreasoned motion. But he says that there are two worlds, the world above and the world below, and that the world above is immortal while the world below is mortal. And he says that the soul is the entelechy of the body.

9,36 Theophrastus of Ephesus held the same opinions as Aristotle.

9,37 Strato of Lampsacus said that heat is the cause of all things. He said that the parts of the world are infinite, and that everything living is capable of having a mind.

9,38 Praxiphanes of Rhodes held the same opinions as Theophrastus.

9,39 Critolaus of Phasela held the same opinions as Aristotle.

9,40 Zeno of Citieum, the Stoic, said that we must not build temples for gods but keep the Godhead in our minds alone—or rather, regard the mind as God, for it is immortal. We should consign the dead to wild beasts or fire. We may indulge in pederasty without restraint. But he said that the divine permeates all things. The causes of things sometimes depend on us and sometimes do not depend on us—that is, some things are up to us while some are not.

He also said that < the soul persists for some time* > after its separation from the body, and called the soul a long-lived spirit but said that is

[43] Zeller οἰκεῖον; MSS οἰστόν.

certainly not fully immortal. For it is exhausted to the point of extinction by the length of its existence, or so he says.

9,41 Cleanthes says that pleasures are the good and noble, and he called only the soul man, and said that the gods are characters in mysteries, and holy calls. And he claimed that the sun is a torch and the world < is holy, and men are* > initiates, and the possessed are priests of the gods.

9,42 Persaeus taught the same doctrines as Zeno.

9,43 Chrysippus of Soli wrote infamous laws. For he said that sons must have relations with their mothers and daughters with their fathers. For the rest he agreed with Zeno of Citieum. But besides this, he said that we should eat human flesh. But he said that the goal of all is to live pleasantly.

9,44 Diogenes of Babylon said that all things consist of pleasure.

9,45 Panaetius of Rhodes said that the universe is immortal and unaging, ignored divination, and pooh poohed what is said about the gods. For he said that the discussion of God is chatter.

9,46 Posidonius of Apamaea said that man's highest good is wealth and health.

9,47 Athenodorus of Tarsus held the same opinions as Chrysippus, and taught the same doctrines as Zeno.

9,48 Epicurus the son of Neocles, who was reared in Athens, pursued a life of pleasure and, as I said of him at the outset, was not ashamed to have relations in public with licentious women.[44] He said in his turn that there are no gods, but that mere chance governs all things. And nothing in the world comes of our own will—not learning, lack of education, or anything else—but that all things happen to everyone unwilled. And it is no use to blame anyone, as he says, or to praise anyone; people do not undergo these things voluntarily.

But he said that death is not to be feared. And as I have said already, he maintained both that everything consists of atoms, and that the universe is infinite.

10,1 And these are the Greek philosophers I have learned of. But there are as many others throughout the barbarian and Greek parts of the Roman realm and the other regions of the world. (2) There are seventy-two repulsive philosophies in the Indian nation, those of the gymnosophists, the

[44] Epicurus is discussed at 1,1,8, but Epiphanius does not say this there. It is likely that he is here quoting a handbook, perhaps the same one in which he found the material for Sects 1,1,5–8.

Brahmans (these are the only praiseworthy ones), the Pseudo-brahmans, the corpse-eaters, the practitioners of obscenity, and those who are past feeling. Because of the great corruption in men, and their practice of evil and < obscenity* >, I consider it unnecessary and not worth my while to speak specifically of the Indian sects and the disgusting things they do. (3) For again, it is said that there are six different sects in Media, and as many in Ethiopia—and among the Persians, or in Parthia, Elamitis, Caspia, Germany, and Sarmatia, or however many there are among the Dauni, or among the Zikchi, Amazons, Lazi, Iberians, Bosporenes, Geli, Chinese or the other nations, there are < any number > of different laws, philosophies and sects and a countless throng of varieties.

10,4 For instance, Chinese men stay at home and weave, and anoint themselves and do womanly things in readiness for their wives. And in reverse, the women cut their hair short, wear men's underclothing, and do all the field labor. But among the Geli, on the contrary, those who do evil are held by their laws to be praiseworthy.

10,5 And how many mysteries and rites do the Greeks have? For example, the women who go to the megara,[45] and those who celebrate the Thesmophoria, are different from each other. And there are as many others: the Eleusinian mysteries of Demeter and Persephone at Eleusis, and the shocking goings-on in the sanctuaries there—the unclothing of women, to put it politely, drums and cakes, the bull-roarer and the basket, the worked wool, the cymbal, and the potion prepared in the beaker.

And just as many others. The mysteries of Archemorus in Pythia (6) and others on the Isthmus, those of Athamas and Melicertes the child of Ino. And all the men who turn the phallus over, and the < women > who celebrate[46] the obscene rites, and the men who serve Rhea by castrating male children and living their lives without male organs, certainly unable to be men any longer, but without having become women. (7) And other Dionysians, those who are initiated into the Curetes and their distribution of meat, who are crowned with snakes and raise the cry of "Va, Va!" Either they are still calling on that Eve who was deceived by the snake, or else they are summoning the snake to their imposture in ancient Hebrew. For by the plain interpretation "Eve" means the woman; but in the ancient language native Hebrew speakers call the snake "chawah."

---

[45] Pits into which pigs were thrown at the Thesmaphoria.
[46] Holl ἑορτάζουσαι . . . < γυναῖκες>, MSS φαλλαρίζουσαι.

11,1 And "What shall I say? For the time will fail me if I tell"[47] of the countless differences in people's various practices, as well as in their virtue and their vice. (2) As many others in Egypt, who are initiates of Cronus and make a show of putting iron collars on their necks, having their hair loose on top, < wearing > filthy, absurd clothing, and piercing their nostrils as though for nose rings at each [festival] of Cronus in the town called Astus. (This is a small town in Egypt, the chief village of the so-called nome of Prosopitis.) This is how they follow the unclean rites of the general assembly of deluded persons, and the mad instructions of the drum beating ecstatics, if you please! But these people are hopelessly lost.

11,3 But just as many of the others! For instance, the cult of Harpocrates near Buticus, or the little town of Butus itself. They are already elders in years, < but are children in behavior* >, and are compelled by the daemon to enact the imaginary frenzies of Horus at the sacred month. (4) But each citizen—even an elder already far along in years, together with young women of the same persuasion, and other ages from youth up—are supposedly priests of this Horus, and of Harpocrates. Their heads are shaved and they shamelessly carry the slavish, as well as accursed and childish emblem, willingly taking part in the games of the daemon's initiates laughing madly and foolishly, and cast off all restraint. (5) First they smear their faces with porridge, flour and other vulgarities, and then they dip their faces in a boiling cauldron and deceitfully madden the crowds with their faces, for a supposed miracle; and they wipe the stuff off their faces with their hands, and give some to anyone who asks, to partake of for their health's sake and as a remedy for their ills.

12,1 But if I were to describe the woman ecstatics in Memphis < and > Heliopolis who bewitch themselves with drums and flutes, and the dancing girls, and the performers at the triennial festival— and the women at Bathys and in the temple of Menuthis who have abandoned shame and womanliness—to what burdens for the tongue, or what a long composition I could commit myself, by adding their countless number [itself] to the number I have already given! (2) For even though I were to take on the enormous task I would leave our comprehension of these things incomplete, since scripture says that there are "young women *without number.*"[48](3) The rites at Sais and Pelusium, at Bubastis and Abydus, the temples of Antinous and the mysteries there. The rites at Pharbetis, those

[47] Heb 11:32.
[48] Cant 6:8.

of Mendesius' goat, all the mysteries in Busiris, all the ones in Sebennytus, all the ones in Diospolis, where they sometimes perform rites for the ass in the name of Seth, or Typho, if you please, while others < worship* > Tithambro, or Hecate, and others are initiates of Senephthy, others of Thermuthi, others of Isis. (4) And how many things of this sort can be said! < If one tries > to name them specifically it will consume a great deal of time. The entire subject will be summed up by the phrase, "young women without number."[49]

12,5 But again, < I omit* > the names of many other mysteries, heresiarchs and fomenters of schism whose leaders are called Magusaeans by the Persians but prophets by the Egyptians, and who preside over their shrines and temples. And those Babylonian magi who are called Gazarenes, sages and enchanters, and the Indians' Evilei so-called, and Brahmans, < and > the Greeks' hierophants and temple custodians, and a throng of Cynics, and the leaders of countless other philosophers.

13,1 As I said, then, [there are] people in Persia called Magusaeans, who detest idols but worship planets,[50] fire, the moon and the sun. And in Greece, again, [there are] others called Abian Musi, who drink mare's milk and live entirely in wild country. (2) And as many of all these as the human mind can take in, which are called "great" and < regarded > as praiseworthy, there are as many different "young women without number,"[51] some praiseworthy, some not. Some, making their practice of asceticism out of their own heads and forming their own rule, appear in public with long hair. Others wear sackcloth openly, though other holy brethren sit in sackcloth and ashes at home. Still others, from their "youth," add to their burden with extra fasts and rules <for the sake of > a perfect conscience towards the bridegroom.

13,3 But others, as I said, do not act the part of "youths" rightly but arbitrarily from some preconception, in contradiction to the truth. Zacchaeus, who has recently died in the hill country around Jerusalem, would never pray with anyone. But for the same reason he freely undertook to handle and consecrate the sacred mysteries although he was a layman. And [there was] another—and he was once one of those who seemed to have led the finest kind of life, and he lived in the hermitages in a monastery in Egypt—(4) [he], and another man, near Sinai, who were made "young"

[49] Cant 6:8.
[50] Holl στοιχείοις, MSS εἰδώλοις which contradicts what has just been said.
[51] Cant 6:8.

by dreaming < that > they had received bishop's orders, and undertook to sit on thrones and perform episcopal functions.

13,5 Others, and not a few of them, have dared, from "youthfulness," to make themselves eunuchs, if you please, contrary to the commandments. (6) But others, whose origins are orthodox, seem to behave like "youths" and venture to gather their own congregations contrary to the canons. Moreover, they rebaptize the people who come to them from the Arians, if you please, without the judgment of an ecumenical council. (7) For because the Arian and the catholic laity are still intermingled, and many are orthodox but are joined with the Arianizers from hypocrisy, the matter, as I said, has not yet been settled by a judgment—not until there can be a separation of the blasphemous sect, and then its sentence will be determined.

13,8 Of the people who rebaptize in this way by their own directive, I have heard that one is a presbyter in Lycia. And there are others as well, who each pray by themselves and never with anyone else; and others wear slave's collars contrary to the ordinance of the church. (9) And so, at the close of the entire work, I have said that those who are "young" in their own way, to suit their own tastes, are "without number"[52]—by no means for good, to practice the various forms of wisdom, judgment, courage, prudence and righteousness. Others of these act "young" more arbitrarily, and perversely make themselves < strangers > to the truth, so that there is no number of them.

14,1 But the one dove herself, the holy virgin, confesses that God is the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, a perfect Father, a perfect Son, and a perfect Holy Spirit. She confesses that the Trinity is co-essential and that the Trinity is not an identity, but that the Son is truly begotten of the Father, and that the Holy Spirit is not different from the Father and the Son, (2) but that the Trinity is everlasting, never needing addition and containing no subordination but reduced to one unity, and one sovereignty of our God and Father.

And all things have been made by this Trinity of Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Once these things did not exist, and they are not contemporaneous with God and were not in being before him; they were brought from nonbeing into being by the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.

14,3 This Father, Son and Holy Spirit has always vouchsafed to appear in visions to his saints, as each was able to receive [the vision] in accordance

[52] Cant 6:8.

with the gift which had been < given > him by the Godhead. This gift was granted to each of those who were deemed worthy, sometimes to see the Father as each was able, < sometimes > to hear his voice as well as he was able. (4) When he said by the mouth of Isaiah, "Lo, my beloved servant shall understand,"[53] this is the voice of the Father. And when Daniel saw "the Ancient of Days,"[54] this is a vision of the Father. And again, when he says in the prophet, "I have multiplied visions and been portrayed by hands of the prophets,"[55] this is the voice of the Son. And when, in Ezekiel, "The Spirit of God took me" and "brought me out unto the plain,"[56] this refers to the Holy Spirit.

14,5 And there are many things of this kind that could be said. I have mentioned parts of a few of them in passing, and quoted the two texts to show what the church is like. But there are a million and more like them in the sacred scriptures of the Old and the New Testaments. (6) And [we find in the scriptures] that the Lord himself formed Adam's body and "breathed the breath of life into him" to make "a living soul" for him.[57] God himself, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, the one Godhead, gave the Law to Moses. The prophets were sent by the same Godhead. He himself is our God, the God of Jews and Christians, and has called those Jews to justification who do not deny our Lord Jesus' advent, and saves all who live by his true faith and do not deny the truth of the proclamation of God's true Gospel doctrine. (7) For the Only-begotten has come! Come! And this is what our mother the church is like—the calm haven of peace, the good cheer redolent of the blossoming[58] of the vine, which bears the "cluster of blessing"[59] for us and daily grants us the drink that soothes all anguish, the blood of Christ, unmixed, true.

15,1 [And there are texts to show] that Christ was truly born of Mary the ever-virgin, by the Holy Spirit's agency, not by the seed of a man. No, he took his body from the holy Virgin herself, truly and not in appearance—truly flesh, truly body, with bones, sinews and everything of ours. He was no different from ourselves except for the glory of his holiness and Godhead, and the holiness and righteousness of his vessel. He had

---

53 Isa 52:13.
54 Dan 7:9.
55 Hos 12:11.
56 Ezek 3:14; 22.
57 Gen 2:7.
58 Cf. Cant 2:13.
59 Cf. 1 Cor 10:16.

the fullness of everything without sin, and possessed a true human soul, a true human mind—not that I affirm the concreteness of the mind, as others do. (2) But he possessed them all unstained by sin, a "mouth" that did not lie, "lips that spoke no guile,"[60] a heart not inclined to rebellion, a mind not perverted to wrong, flesh that did not did not indulge in fleshly pleasure. He was perfect God from on high, but had not come to dwell *in* a man; he himself became wholly incarnate, without changing his nature but including his own manhood together with his Godhead.

15,3 He truly entered the Virgin's womb, was carried for the usual time, and was born without shame, unstained, undented, through the birth canals. He was nursed, was embraced by Simeon and Anna, was borne in Mary's arms. He learned to walk, went on journeys, became a boy and grew up in full possession of all human characteristics. His age was counted in years and his gestation in months, (4) for he was "made of a woman, made under the Law."[61]

He came to the Jordan and was baptized by John. This was not because he needed cleansing but, in keeping with his manhood under the Law, not to confuse what was right, and so that "all righteousness might be fulfilled,"[62] as he himself said—and to show that he had taken true flesh, true manhood. He went down into the water to give, not to receive; to provide generously, not from need; to enlighten the water, and empower it to become a type of those who would be perfected in it. Thus those who truly believe in him and hold the faith of the truth would learn that he had truly become man and truly been baptized, (5) and would therefore come themselves with his assent, receive the power of his descent, and be illumined by his illumination. This is the fulfillment of the oracle in the prophet about a change of power,[63] about the giving of the power of salvation of the bread which is taken from Jerusalem, and of the strength of the water. (16,1) But the power of the bread and the strength of the water are here made strong in Christ, so that not bread, but the power of bread will be our power. Indeed, the bread is food, but the power in it is for the generation of life. [And the water is strength], not merely so that the water will cleanse us, but so that, by the strength of the water,

---

60 Cf. 1 Pet 2:22.

61 Gal 4:4.

62 Matt 3:15.

63 LXX Isa. 3:1, "Behold, the Master, the Lord of hosts, will take away from Judah and Jerusalem the strong man and the strong woman, the strength of bread and the strength of water."

sanctifying < power > may become ours for the achievement of our salvation through faith, work, hope, the celebration of the mysteries, and the naming [of the Trinity].

16,2 He came up out of the Jordan and heard the Father's voice, < for the Father bore witness* > in the hearing of the disciples who were present, to show who it was for whom he was testifying. And as I have said in many Sects, the Holy Spirit descended in the form of a dove to prevent the Trinity's being thought an identity, since the Spirit appears in his own person. The Spirit settled and "came upon him"[64] so that the Object of his testimony be seen; to testify that his holy flesh is dear to the Father and the Holy Spirit and approved by them; to declare the Father's approval of the Son's incarnation; to show that the Son is a true Son; and, in fulfillment of the scripture, "And after these things he appeared on the earth and consorted with men."[65]

16,3 He came up out of the Jordan, was plainly and truly tempted by the devil in the wilderness, and grew hungry afterwards in keeping with and because of the reality of his human nature. (4) He chose disciples, preached truth and healed diseases; he slept, grew hungry, made journeys, performed miracles, raised the dead, gave sight to the blind, strengthened the lame and the palsied. He preached the Gospel, the truth, the kingdom of heaven, and the lovingkindness of himself, the Father and the Holy Spirit.

17,1 He truly underwent the passion for us in his flesh and perfect manhood. He truly suffered on the cross in company with his Godhead, though this was not changed to passibility but was impassible and unalterable. The two inferences can clearly be perceived: Christ suffered for us in the flesh";[66] but he remained impassible in his Godhead. (2) It is not that the manhood is a separate thing and the Godhead a separate thing; the Godhead accompanies the manhood and yet, because of the purity and incomparability of its essence, does not suffer. < Christ > suffered in the flesh, however, and was put to death in the flesh, though he lives forever in Godhead and raises the dead.

17,3 But his body was truly buried and remained lifeless for the three days without breath and motion—wrapped in the shroud, laid in the tomb, shut in by the stone and the seal of those who had imposed it. Yet the

---

[64] Matt 3:16.
[65] Bar 3:38.
[66] 1 Pet 4:1.

Godhead was not shut in, the Godhead was not buried; (4) it descended to the underworld with the holy soul, took the captive souls from there, broke the "sting of death,"[67] "shattered" the bars and the unbreakable "bolts,"[68] and by its own authority "loosed the pains of hades."[69]

It ascended with the soul, for "the soul had not been left in hell, nor had the flesh seen corruption;"[70] (5) the Godhead had raised it or the Lord himself, the divine Word and Son of God, had risen with soul, body and entire vessel, with the vessel at last united with spirit. His body itself was spirit though it had once been tangible, had been subjected to scourging by the free consent of the Godhead, had consented to temptation by Satan and had experienced hunger, sleep, weariness, grief and sorrow. (6) The holy body itself was at last united with the Godhead, though the Godhead had always been with the holy body which underwent such sufferings. For Christ had risen and united his body with himself, as one spirit, one unity, one glory, his own one Godhead.

17,7 For he truly appeared and was handled by Thomas, ate and drank with the apostles and consorted with them for forty days and forty nights. Indeed, he "entered where doors were barred,"[71] and after entering displayed sinews and bones, the mark of the nails and the mark of the lance. For it was indeed the body itself, (8) since it had been joined to one unity and one Godhead, with no further expectation of suffering, no further death, as the holy apostle says, "Christ is risen, he dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him."[72] What had been passible remains forever impassible, the divine nature with body, soul, and all its human nature. (9) He is very God and has ascended into the heavens and taken his seat at the Father's right hand in glory, not by discarding his body but by uniting it to spirit in the perfection of one Godhead, just as our own bodies, though "sown as natural bodies" for now, "will be raised spiritual; though sown in corruption for now, will be raised in incorruption; though sown in mortality for now will be raised in immortality."[73]

17,10 Now if such is the case with our [own] bodies, how much more with that holy, inexpressible, incomparable, pure body united with God,

---

[67] 1 Cor 15:55–56.
[68] Cf. Ps 106:16.
[69] Acts 2:24.
[70] Cf. Acts 2:27; Ps 15:10.
[71] Cf. John 20:19; 26.
[72] Rom 6:9.
[73] Cf. 1 Cor 15:44; 53.

the one body in its final uniqueness? The apostle also testifies to this and says, "Even if we knew Christ after the flesh, now know we him no more."[74] (11) It is not that he separated his flesh from his Godhead; < he displayed it* > as it was and united with his Godhead, no longer fleshly but spiritual, as the scripture says, "according to the Spirit of holiness after the resurrection from the dead of our Lord Jesus Christ."[75] At the same time [he displayed] this flesh divine, impassible and yet having suffered—and having been buried, having risen, having ascended in glory, coming to judge the quick and the dead as the scripture truly says, "Of his kingdom there shall be no end."[76]

18,1 For our mother, the holy church herself, believes as has been truly preached to her and enjoined upon her, that we shall all fall asleep and be raised with this body, with this soul, with our whole vessel, "that each may receive according to that he hath done."[77] (2) It is true that the resurrection of the dead, eternal judgment, the kingdom of heaven, and repose < are in store > for the righteous, and the inheritance of the faithful and an angelic choir is awaiting those who have kept the faith, purity, hope and the Lord's commandments. And it has been proclaimed, certified and believed that "These shall rise to life eternal,"[78] as we read in the Gospels.

18,3 For whatever the apostle and all the scriptures say is true, even though it is taken in a different sense by unbelievers and those who misunderstand it. (4) But this is our faith, this is our honor, this is our mother the church who saves through faith, who is strengthened through hope, and who by Christ's love is made perfect in the confession of faith, the mysteries, and the cleansing power of baptism—(5) for < he says >, "Go, baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."[79] [Baptize, that is], in the name of the divine Trinity, for the name admits of no distinction; God is preached and proclaimed to us as one in the Law, the Prophets, the Gospels and the Apostles, in the Old and New Testaments, and is believed in as one—Father, Son and Holy Spirit. (6) The Godhead is no identity but truly a perfect Trinity. The Father is perfect, the Son is perfect, the Holy Spirit is perfect, one Godhead, one God, to

74 2 Cor 5:16.
75 Rom 1:4.
76 Luke 1:33.
77 2 Cor 5:10.
78 John 5:29.
79 Matt 28:19.

whom be glory, honor and might, now and forever and to the ages of ages. Amen.

19,1 This is the faith, the process of our salvation. This is the stay of the truth; this is Christ's virgin and harmless dove. This is life, hope and the assurance of immortality. (2) But I beg all you readers to pardon my mediocrity and the feebleness of my very limited mind—torpid and ill as it is from a heavy dose of the sects' poison, like the mind of a man vomiting and nauseated—for the expressions I have been brought[80] to use in referring to certain persons < with harshness* > or severity or calling them "offenders," "scum," "dupes" or "frauds." (3) Though I do not readily make fun of anyone, I have had to dispose of them with expressions like these to dispel certain persons' notions. Otherwise they might think that, since I have publicly disclosed the things the sects say and do, I have some measure of agreement with the heresy of each of the sects.

19,4 I also composed a brief Proem[81] at the beginning of the work to give advance assurance of this and ask for pardon, so that no one would suppose that I turn to mockery because I am beaten, and fault me for unpleasantness. In the Proem I also indicated which sects I would cover, into how many Volumes I had divided the whole work, and how many sects, and which ones, I had spoken of in each Volume. Here again I remind us of these things, to do the readers good at every point.

20,1 There are three Volumes, and seven Sections. In Volume One there are forty-six Sects, enumerated by name and arranged consecutively < throughout the > Volume from the first and the second until the last. For Volume One contains forty-six Sects in three Sections, Volume Two contains twenty-three Sects in two Sections, but Volume Three, eleven in two. (2) I beg and plead with all of you who are sharing my labor and reading with patient effort, reap the benefit but put the sects' odious doctrines out of your minds. I have not made them public to do harm but to do good, and to make sure that no one falls under their spell.

20,3 As you go through the whole work, or even parts of it, pray for me and make request that God will give me a portion in the holy and only catholic and apostolic church and the true, life-giving and saving < faith >, and deliver me from every sect. (4) And if, in my humanity, I cannot reach the full measure of the incomprehensible and ineffable Godhead, but am still pressed to offer its defense < and > compelled to speak for God in

[80] Holl ἠνέχθη<ν>, Drexl and MSS ἠνέχθή.
[81] Pan. Proem I.

human terms, and have been led by daring [to do so], you yourselves pardon me, for God does. (5) And once more, pray that the Lord may give me the portion in his holy faith which I have asked for, the only faith free of all inconsistency, and grant the pardon of my own sins, which are many, in Christ Jesus our Lord, through whom and with whom be glory to the Father with the Holy Spirit forever. Amen.

21,1 I have spoken briefly of the tenets of the faith of this only catholic church and harmless dove, her husband's only wife as the scripture says, "One is my dove."[82] have likewise spoken of the countless "young women without number,"[83] the co-essentiality of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, the fleshly and perfect advent of Christ, and other parts of the faith. (2) But as to her ordinances, I must once more partially describe, in a few words, as many ordinances as have actually been observed and are being observed in the church, some by commandment, others by voluntary acceptance. For God rejoices in the excellence of his church.

21,3 And to begin with, the basis and, as it were, the foundation in the church is the virginity which is practiced and observed by many, and held in honor. But for most monks and nuns, the single life is the concomitant of this virginity. (4) After virginity is continence, which sets out on the same course. Next comes widowhood with all soberness and a pure life. (5) Following these orders, lawful wedlock is held in high esteem, especially marriage to one partner only and with the observance of the commandments. (6) But if a person's wife or husband dies < and he [or she] wants > a spouse, it is allowable to marry a second wife or husband after the death of the first husband or wife.

21,7 But the crown, or, as it were, the mother and begetress of all these, is the holy priesthood, which is drawn mostly from virgins, but if not from virgins, from once-married men. (8) If there are not enough once-married men to serve, it is composed of men who abstain from relations with their own wives, or widowers who have had only one wife. But beginning with the episcopal order and including presbyters, deacons and sub-deacons, it is not permissible to receive a twice-married person for priesthood in the church, even if he is continent < or > a widower. (9) Then, after this priesthood, comes the order of readers which is composed of all the orders—that is, of virgins, once-married men, the continent, widowers, and men who are still in lawful wedlock—if necessary, even of men who have mar-

[82] Cant 6:9.
[83] Cant 6:9.

ried a second wife after the death of the first. For a reader is not a priest; he is like a scribe of the Law.

21,10 Deaconesses are also appointed—only to assist women for modesty's sake, if there is a need because of baptism or an inspection of their bodies. (11) Then, after these, come exorcists and translators < from > one language to another, either in readings or in sermons. But finally there are undertakers, who enshroud the bodies of those who fall asleep; and doorkeepers, and the whole good order [of the laity].

22,1 On the apostles' authority services are set for the fourth day of the week, the eve of the Sabbath, and the Lord's Day.[84] But we fast till the ninth hour on the fourth day and the eve of the Sabbath, because the Lord was arrested at the beginning of the fourth day and crucified on the eve of the Sabbath. (2) And the apostles taught us to keep fasts on these days in fulfillment of the saying, "When the bridegroom is taken from them, that shall they fast on those days."[85] (3) Fasting is not enjoined upon us as a favor to Him who suffered for us, but so that we may confess that the Lord's passion to which he consented for us < has become > our salvation, and that our fasts may be acceptable to God for our sins. (4) And < this > fasting is observed throughout the year in this holy catholic church—I mean fasting till the ninth hour on the fourth day and the eve of the Sabbath—(5) with the sole exception of the full Pentecost of fifty days, during which neither kneeling nor fasting is enjoined, but services are held in the early morning hours as on the Lord's Day, in place of those at the ninth hour on the fourth day and the eve of the Sabbath. (6) But moreover, there is no fasting < or kneeling > during the fifty days of Pentecost, as I said, or on the Day of the Epiphany when the Lord was born in the flesh, even though it may be the fourth day or the eve of the Sabbath.

22,7 But the church's ascetics fast with a good will every day except the Lord's Day and Pentecost, and hold continual vigils. (8) This holy catholic church regards all the Lord's Days as days for enjoyment, however, and holds services at dawn, < but > does not fast; it is inappropriate to fast on a Lord's Day. (9) The church also observes the forty days before the seven days of the holy Passover with fasts every day, but never fasts on Lord's Days, or on the actual fortieth day [before Easter].

22,10 All of the laity eat dry fare every day—I mean by taking only bread, salt and water in the evening—during the six days of the Passover.

---

[84] Cf. Didascalia 21.
[85] Luke 5:35.

(11) Moreover, the zealous do two, three and four times more than this, and some [fast] the entire week until cockcrow at the dawn of the Lord's Day, and keep vigil on all six days. Again, they hold services from the ninth hour until evening during these six days, and on the whole fortieth day [before the Passover]. (12) But in some places they hold vigils only from the dawn of the day after the fifth until the eve of the Sabbath, and the Lord's Day. (13) In some places the liturgy is performed at the ninth hour of the fifth day at the close of the vigil, but they are still on dry fare. (14) In other places there is no liturgy except at dawn on the Lord's Day when the vigil closes at about cockcrow on the Day of the Resurrection, and with a festal assembly on the principal day of the Passover, as has been prescribed. But the other mysteries, baptism and the private mysteries, are performed in accordance with the tradition of the Gospel and the apostles.

23,1 They make memorials for the dead by name, offering prayers and the liturgy. There are always hymns at dawn and prayers at dawn in this holy church, as well as psalms and prayers at lamp-lighting time.

23,2 Some of the church's monks live in the cities, but some reside in monasteries and retire far from the world. (3) Some, if you please, see fit to wear their hair long as a custom of their own devising, though the Gospel did not command this, and the apostles did not allow it. For the holy apostle Paul has forbidden this style.

23,4 But there are other, excellent disciplines which are observed in this catholic church, I mean abstinence from meat of all kinds—four-footed animals, birds, fish, eggs and cheese; and various other customs, since "Each shall receive his reward according to his labor."[86] (5) And some abstain from all of these, while some abstain only from four-footed animals, but eat birds and the rest. Others also abstain from birds, but eat eggs and fish. Others do not even eat eggs, while others eat only fish. Others abstain from fish too but eat only cheese, while others do not even eat cheese. And at the present time still others abstain from bread, and others from fruits and vegetables.

23,6 Many monks sleep on the ground, and others do not even wear shoes. Others wear sackcloth under their clothing—the ones who wear it properly, for virtue and repentance. It is inappropriate to appear publicly in sackcloth, as some do; and, as I said, it is also inappropriate to appear

[86] 1 Cor 3:8.

in public wearing collars, as some prefer to. But most monks abstain from bathing.

23,7 And some monks have renounced their means of livelihood, but devised light tasks for themselves which are not troublesome, so that they will not lead an idle life or eat at others' expense. (8) Most are exercised in psalms and constant prayers, and in readings, and recitations by heart, of the holy scriptures.

24,1 The custom of hospitality, kindness, and almsgiving to all has been prescribed for all members of this holy catholic and apostolic church. (2) The church has baptism in Christ in place of the obsolete circumcision, < and > rests in the Great Sabbath instead of on the lesser sabbath.

24,3 The church refrains from fellowship with any sect. It forbids fornication, adultery, licentiousness, idolatry, murder, all law-breaking, magic, sorcery, astrology, palmistry, the observation of omens, charms, and amulets, the things called phylacteries. (4) It forbids theatrical shows, hunting, horse < races >, musicians and all evil-speaking and slander, all quarreling and blasphemy, injustice, covetousness and usury. (5) It does not accept actors, but regards them as the lowest of the low. It accepts offerings from people who are not wrongdoers and law-breakers, but live righteously.

24,6 It continually enjoins prayers to God at the appointed night hours and after the close of the day, with all frequency, fervor, and bowing of the knee. (7) In some places they also hold services on the Sabbaths, but not everywhere. By the command of the Savior the best refrain entirely from swearing, abuse and cursing, and certainly from lying, as far as this is in their power. But most sell their goods and give to the poor.

25,1 Such is the character of this holy < mother of ours >, together with her faith as we have described it; and these are the ordinances that obtain in her. For this is the character of the church, and by the will of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit it is drawn from the Law, the Prophets, the Apostles and the Evangelists, like a good antidote compounded of many perfumes for the health of its users. (2) These are the features of this chaste bride of Christ; this is her dowry, the covenant of her inheritance, and the will of her bridegroom and heavenly < king >, our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom and with whom be glory, honor and might to the Father with the Holy Spirit, forever and ever. Amen.

25,3 All the brethren who are with me greet your Honors, especially Anatolius whose task, with much labor and the utmost good will, has been to transcribe and correct the work against these sects, I mean the eighty, in shorthand notes. (4) His most honored fellow deacon Hypatius

also [greets you], who copied the transcription from notes to quires [of papyrus]. Please pray for them, my most honored and truly beloved brethren. (5) The peace of our Lord Jesus Christ and his grace, and his truth in accordance with his commandment, be with you all, my most scholarly beloved brethren! Amen.

INDEX

Note: References to sects and sectarian leaders are generally to mentions which occur outside of the principal discussions. For the principal discussions, consult the Table of Contents and the Anacephalaeoses.

Aaron 2, 33, 53, 80, 81, 91, 92, 317, 441, 507, 626, 638
Abgar, bishop of Cyrus 472
Abgar of Edessa 88
Abidas 88
Abraham 13, 30, 31, 32, 37, 38, 45, 77, 79, 80, 81, 83, 84, 85, 87, 113, 133, 174, 179, 186, 268, 289, 291, 311, 317, 319, 322, 323, 351, 352, 382, 389, 417, 418, 432, 479, 485, 486, 587, 619, 638, 648, 652, 654, 658, 661, 662
abstention from work 277–278, 648, 681
abstinence from bathing 681
abstinence from foods 14, 71, 139, 217, 319, 323, 426, 680
abstinence from sexual relations 103, 107, 652, 678
Acacians 470
Acacius, bishop of Caesarea 471
actors not admitted to the church 681
Acts of Pilate 24
Acvas, Manichaean missionary 226
Adam
  buried on Golgotha 212
  created in First Man's image 259, 275
  ecstasy of sleep 10, 11
  expulsion of 16, 70, 415
  knowledge of Eve 372–373
  loses the image of God 138, 415, 416
Adamians 1
Addas, Manichaean missionary 232, 239, 261
adoptionism 380, 382, 397, 440
adoptive wives 131, 132, 323, 624
aeons, Valentinian 55, 60, 438
Aerius, biography 411–412
Aetians 137, 221, 412, 483
Aetius, the Anomoean
  alleged understanding of God 412
  biography 412
  episcopal consecration 511
  exile 483, 512
  moral laxism 515
  Syntagmation 511
Agabus 13, 286, 490
Alexander, bishop of Alexandria 329, 333, 334, 335, 336, 338, 339, 340, 341
Alexander, bishop of Constantinople 328
Ambrose, patron of Origen 135, 136
Ammonius 337, 441
Anathemas on Trinitarian subjects 442, 455, 456, 457, 458, 467
Anatolius, Epiphanius' amanuensis 681
Anaxagoras 663
Anaximander 663
Ancoratus 356, 483
  excerpt from, on the Holy Spirit 484–499
Ancrya, Council of (358 A.D.) 444
Ancyra, encyclical of Council of (Basil of Ancyra) 444–458
Andrew 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 48, 624, 639
angels 33, 39, 52, 65, 68, 89, 115, 133, 137, 152, 159, 172, 173, 174, 207, 256, 315, 389, 390, 391, 403, 404, 560, 562, 606
  created in order to care for creation 161, 220
  creation of 169, 220, 365, 374, 377–378, 496, 551, 560, 561
  one species of immortals among many 172, 173, 174, 345, 346, 568
Anianus, bishop of Antioch 468, 473
Ann and Joachim, parents of Mary 630, 641
Anomoeans 137, 221, 412, 483
Antichrist 7, 28, 475
Antidicomarians 581
Antioch, Council of, 268 A.D. 216, 226, 428
Antioch, Council of, Second 341 A.D. 445
Antioch, Council of, Third 429
Antisthenes 666
Antoninus Pius, emperor 6, 88, 247
Antoninus Verus (Marcus Aurelius) emperor 88
apocryphal Acts of Apostles 536, 646
Apocryphon of Ezekiel 208, 209

Apollinarius, bishop of Laodicaea 249, 583, 584, 585, 586, 603, 604, 608, 609, 615, 616
Apollonius, imperial official 18, 88, 471
apostles, earning living 650
Apostolics 61, 123
Apotactics 2, 116
Arabia 1, 2, 52, 79, 227, 302, 331, 427, 616–636, 637, 662
Arcesilaus 666
Archelaus 36, 238, 596, 623
  opponent of Mani 234, 235, 237–238, 239
  written refutation of Mani 249, 252–261
Archelaus, son of Apollodorus 663
Archon
  chief 256, 277
  of darkness 260, 281, 282
  of destruction 256
  of righteousness 84
archons 230, 236, 249, 251, 261, 272, 273, 274–275, 281, 284, 290
  create man in their image 280, 304
  creation of Adam and Eve 259–260
  crucified by Living Spirit 254, 262
  eat First Man's armor 253, 257, 259, 270, 271, 304
  robbed of their power 251, 256, 277
Archontics 100, 274, 617
Arian factions 459, 468
Arians 215, 221, 248, 328, 329, 330, 332, 412, 433, 468, 472, 479, 513, 514, 544, 565, 579, 584, 592, 602, 636, 671
Ariminum, Council of, 359 A.D. 467, 469
Aristippus of Cyrene 665
Aristotle 398, 556, 666
Arius 99, 100, 115, 125, 327, 328, 448
  biography 215
  death 324
  deposition of 413, 444
  to Eusebius of Nicomedia 327–329, 339
  exposed by Melitius 326, 335
  interpretation of Prov 8:22 343, 353
  Letter of Athanasius 583–593
Arsenius, alleged victim of Athanasius 330, 331, 332
Artotyrites 1, 22, 23
Ascension of Isaiah 319
Asclepius, bishop of Gaza 336
Asia 27, 445, 489, 624
Asterius, Arian writer 437, 439, 440, 513
Athanasius, bishop of Scythopolis 482
Athanasius of Alexandria 334, 599
  accused at Tyre 330–331
  attitude towards Marcellus 436
  consecrated 329, 340–341
  Epistle to Epicretus of Corinth 582, 583–593
  exile to Italy 331–332
  refutation of Mani 249
Athenodorus of Tarsus 667
atonement 486, 587, 632. *See also* redemption
Audians 411
Audius, biography 413, 426
Aurelian, emperor 216, 227, 246, 248, 305
Auxentius, Arian bishop of Milan 150, 151, 583

baptism
  Christian 104, 109, 119, 415, 417, 500, 505, 534, 643, 676, 679, 680, 681
  Eunomian style of 412, 579, 580
  the first/decisive repentance 104–105
  of Jesus 33, 39, 42, 43, 46, 47, 48, 51, 596, 639
  non-Christian 23
  repentance after 109, 112, 113
baptismal formula 500
Bardesanes 88, 89, 90, 91
Bardesians 2
Basil, bishop of Ancyra 428, 444, 467, 482
Basil, bishop of Galatia 436
bathing 186, 626, 627
  abstained from by Christian monks 681
  forbidden Manichaean elect 257
battle between light and darkness (Manichaean) 253–254
begetting of the Son 93, 125, 379, 381, 392, 432, 438, 439, 454, 455, 527, 531, 535, 537, 542, 544, 547, 548, 552, 559, 566, 569, 570
  alleged to involve suffering 91–94, 217, 344, 355, 364
  Arian version of the begetting 341, 343, 353, 355–356
  eternal and not in time 398, 399
  without passion/suffering/physical effect 355, 461, 464, 465, 477
bishop and presbyter said to be the same 505, 506
bishops of Jerusalem, circumcised 421, 422

blood accusation 1, 21
body, human
= "flesh" 185–186
can be subject to God's Law 182, 183, 184, 185
immortality of 163, 164, 165
as microcosm 256
as part of the Darkness (Manichaean) 252, 258
prison of the fallen soul 156, 157, 158, 159
resurrection of the 24, 101, 168, 173, 174, 175, 187, 196, 203, 211, 215, 317, 318, 321, 435, 605
source of sin 156
spiritual 197, 198, 207
body of Christ
arose from Wisdom 350, 353, 450–452, 453, 455, 467
brought down from on high 583, 585, 673
co-essential with the Godhead 581, 586, 587, 590
eternally begotten 585, 617–618
without mind 581, 582, 599, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605
as Word made flesh 430, 581, 584, 585, 587–593, 600, 603–604, 607, 610, 611
Book of the Mysteries (Manichaean) 229
Book of the Summaries (Kephalaia) 229
born of God 271
bread, Manichaean prayer before eating 258
bread and cheese as eucharistic elements 23
burial of Jesus 301

Cainites 617
Callinicus, Melitian bishop of Pelusium 328
Carinus, emperor 248
Carneades 666
Carus, emperor 248
castration 2, 100, 101, 102–103, 133, 304, 318, 668, 671
catechumen (Manichaean) 237, 257, 258, 278, 280, 616
Cathari (Purists) 2, 116
celibacy 3, 628
Celsus 34
Cerdonians 617
Cerinthus 27, 28, 32, 33, 36, 38
Chaamu, rites 52
children cannot be saved 318, 320, 321
Christ. *See also* body of Christ; human nature of Christ; Incarnation of Christ; natures of Christ
alleged to exist only from Mary's time 411, 428, 429, 430
called Immanuel 591, 592, 596, 642
conception of 351, 478, 628, 642
date of crucifixion of 55
dates of conception of 61–62
divinity of 73, 127, 128, 217, 343, 362, 363, 365, 402, 429, 454, 476, 488
glorification/spiritualization of the risen 395, 405, 562, 588, 675–676
Holy Spirit allegedly greater than 428
human mind in Jesus replaced by 608–612
impassibility of divine nature of 55, 58, 89, 149, 353, 363, 365, 369, 370, 377, 395, 457, 487, 559, 597, 609–610, 674, 675, 676
Mary allegedly not the mother of 234
priesthood of 364, 365, 366
psilanthropism 2, 27, 28, 32, 45, 73, 77–78, 93, 216, 223, 351, 361, 375, 390
resurrection of body of 58, 59, 370, 387, 394, 601, 676
revealed in female form 1, 22, 72
son of David 30, 31, 269, 351, 486, 585, 592, 625
sufferings of 585, 675
transcendence of 466, 476, 532, 534, 612
transfiguation of 145, 149, 408, 596
virgin birth of 30, 31, 73, 269, 587–588, 620–621, 630, 673
chronology of Jesus' life 35–63
Chrysippus 667
Church of the Martyrs 326
circumcision 25, 33, 34, 80, 217, 247, 363, 422, 490, 499, 588, 613, 614, 681
Claudius, emperor 13, 37, 66
Cleanthes 667
Cleobius 32
Cleobulus 32, 237
clergy
abolition of 81
apostles as preachers 650
celibacy of 628
circumcised priesthood 80
deaconesses 639, 640, 679
earn their living 650
living in luxury and wantonness 413

Mary not allowed 638–639
ordained by Melitius 326, 327
priestesses 640
standards of behavior 106–107, 110, 650, 678
suppored by laity 650
women as 1, 22, 639
clod of earth (Manichaean) 259, 260
co-esssential. *See* homoousion
coitus interruptus 131
Colluthians 334
Colluthus 334, 335
Collyridians 581
Colorbasians 617
conception of Christ, suggested dates 61–62
concubines, eighty = sects 653, 654, 657, 660, 661, 663
confessors 132, 135, 325, 326, 327, 328, 330, 336, 416, 441, 443, 469, 510
Constans, emperor 332, 334
Constantine, emperor 248, 327, 328, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 339, 340, 342, 421, 479
Constantius, emperor 248, 332, 334, 342, 412, 428, 429, 444, 445, 468, 469, 470, 512, 580, 646
consulships during Jesus' lifetime 51, 53, 54–55
Consummation 8, 259, 286, 292
continence 1, 5, 105, 107, 122, 197, 215, 288, 318, 622, 628
of Adamians 69
in marriage 14, 118, 119, 652
of Paul 103
required for priesthood 14, 106, 107, 678
and salvation 317, 321
and subjection of body 183, 313
Core 51, 52, 635
Council of Ancrya 358 A.D. 444
Council of Ancyra, encyclical (Basil of Ancyra) 444–458
Council of Antioch, 268 A.D. 216, 226, 428
Council of Antioch, Second 341 A.D. 445
Council of Antioch, Third 429
Council of Ariminum 359 A.D. 467, 469
Council of Nicaea 104, 106, 327, 434, 583
Creed 421, 441, 469, 479, 503, 505, 585, 586, 600
deposes Arius 340, 584
Council of Rome 583
Council of Sardica 343 A.D. 223, 428, 444, 445
Council of Seleucia 359 A.D. 443, 469, 482, 489
Synodical Letter of 470–472
Council of Sirmium, first 351 A.D. 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 444, 445, 460
Crates of Thebes 666
Creation
ex nihilo 553
as manifestation of God's goodness 244, 551–552
not necessary to the Father 557–558
perfection of 541
creatures, stable and as creator intended 447
Creed of Nicaea 421, 441, 469, 479, 503, 505, 585, 586, 600
Creed of Seleucia 470–472
Criscentius 421
Critolaus of Phasela 666
crucifixion of Christ, date 55
Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem 248, 468, 469, 473, 482
Cyril, elderly bishop consecrated by Eutychius 482

Daniel 9, 67, 80, 98, 167, 672
Daniel, father of 80
Darkness (Manichaean) 252, 253–254, 258, 260, 281, 282
David 12, 79, 80, 149, 154, 158, 190, 209, 210, 219, 269, 373, 376, 378, 382, 415, 430, 435, 485, 489, 497
dawn prayers 679–680
Days of Unleavened Bread 422–423
deaconesses 639, 640, 679
dead, commemorated in liturgy 506, 509, 680
death, reason for 162, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 175
Decius, emperor 104, 134
Demas 32
Democritus 664
Demophilus, bishop 483
desire/coveting 5, 110, 169, 184, 187–189, 193, 195, 256, 295, 296, 297, 298, 310, 311, 604
Devil 188–189, 192
a created being 160–163
impassibility of 160
not created evil 242–243
rebellion 161
Didascalia. *See* Ordinance of the Apostles
Dimoerites 581, 582, 616

Diocletian, emperor 248, 316, 324, 334
Diogenes of Babylon 667
Diogenes of Smyrna 665
Diogenes the Cynic 666
divinity of Christ/Son 73, 127, 128, 217, 343, 362, 363, 365, 402, 429, 454, 476, 488
divorce 107, 108. *See also* marriage
Donatists 115
dove
= the Christ 46
= the church 111, 112, 397, 653, 657, 660, 661, 678
Holy Spirit descends in form of 39, 45, 48, 94, 127, 560, 674
dualism, Manichaean 228, 229, 230, 233, 235, 236, 240, 241, 244, 252–256, 290–291, 357

earth created in eight forms 254
east wind dislodges souls from moon 255
Easter. *See* Passover
Ebion 27, 32, 36, 38, 73
Ebionites 1, 71, 351, 367
ecstasy 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 669
Ecthesis Macrostichos 428, 429, 444
Egyptian Gospel 124
Elder (Manichaean supernatural figure) 260, 282
elders 640
elect (Manichaean term) 236, 257, 258, 259, 277, 278
elements (Manichaean) 253, 271, 272, 273, 276
Eleusis, Arian bishop 472, 505
Eleusis, bishop of Cyzicus 468
Eleutheropolis 226, 326, 468, 471
Elijah 12, 80, 81, 103, 133, 145, 149, 175, 197, 198, 309, 417, 594, 641, 648
Elkasaites 1, 71
Elxai 1, 71, 72, 257
Empedocles of Agrigentum 665
Encratites 1, 2, 6, 116, 122
Enoch 197, 291, 305, 417, 638, 658
Ephrem Syrus 51, 646
Epictetus of Corinth 582, 583
Epicurus 667
Epiphanes 131
Epiphanius, Letter to Arabia 616–636
Epiphany 42, 49, 51, 52, 53, 60, 61, 679
Epistle to the Hebrews, rejected by Arians 364
Esau 5, 81
Eucharist 23, 116, 505, 643
Eudoxius, bishop of Alexandria 468, 471, 472, 482
Eunomians 412
Eunomius, Anomoean 412, 482, 483, 579, 580
eunuchs 2, 100, 101, 102–103, 133, 304, 318, 668, 671
Euphemites 581, 646, 647
Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 333, 336, 339, 340
Eusebius of Caesarea 88, 134, 135, 136, 139, 216, 227, 247, 249, 330, 336, 337
Eusebius of Emesa, refutation of Mani 249
Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste 468, 504–505
accused of Arianism 411
Eutychius, bishop of Eleutheropolis 458, 468, 469, 471, 472, 473, 482
Euzoeus, Arian bishop of Caesarea 339, 468, 472, 482
Eve 12, 22, 23, 70, 196, 199, 200, 201, 202, 254, 260, 268, 270, 279, 281, 317, 361, 372, 630, 631, 632, 637, 638, 643, 644, 652, 668
evil, origin of 242–243, 284, 285, 288, 290, 569
Evilei 670
exorcists 18, 679
Ezekiel 9, 144, 146, 208, 211, 672

fasting 25, 139, 211, 412, 417, 423, 506, 648, 679
Father
allegedly not the God of the Law 201, 282, 298, 310, 358, 387
allegedly prior to the Son 337, 338, 434
begetting of the Son 93, 125, 379, 381, 392, 432, 438, 439, 454, 455, 527, 531, 535, 537, 542, 544, 547, 548, 552, 559, 566, 569, 570
begetting of the Son allegedly involves suffering 355, 364
as cause of the Son and Holy Spirit 557–558
scriptural names of 494
"self-begotten" 575
without passion 461, 464, 465, 477
feasting 423
final conflagration 147, 258, 261
final restoration of all things 261
firmament = body of the archons 254, 256, 261, 274

First Man (Manichaean) 253, 254, 259, 271, 272, 273, 274
first principles 55, 88, 89, 90, 95, 215, 224, 225, 235, 241, 242, 287, 288, 461, 663, 665, 666
foods, abstinence from 14, 71, 139, 217, 319, 323, 426, 680
fortieth day before Easter 679–680
free will 117, 119, 135, 162, 168, 189, 191, 270, 297, 304, 340, 344, 354, 378, 388, 652

Gelasius, consecrated by Cyril of Jerusalem 482
Gemellinus, Arian bishop 482
generacy of the Son (Aetius' term) 338, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 537, 538, 542, 543, 546, 547, 549, 554, 555, 556, 563, 565, 567, 568, 569, 572, 573, 574, 575
George, Arian bishop of Alexandria 332, 412, 468, 471, 472, 483, 511, 512
George, bishop of Laodicea 249, 433, 437, 443, 444, 445, 468, 473, 482
gifts of grace 7, 8, 17, 68
glorification/spiritualization of the risen Christ 395, 405, 562, 588, 675–676
Gnostics 73, 100, 617
God
  allegedly good but not just 250
  God of the Law 201, 282, 298, 310, 358, 387
  God of this world (Manichaean term) 293, 295, 296, 297
  ingenerate God 522, 523, 528, 530–532, 538, 540, 545, 553, 568, 575
  pagan view 71, 325, 353, 418, 511, 544, 552, 572, 576, 584, 646
  two Gods 217, 224, 252, 380, 435, 461
  unbegotten 400, 401
Gospel (Manichaean) 233
Gospel according to Matthew in Hebrew 30
Gospel narrative harmonized 29–35
Gratian, emperor 8, 248

Hadrian, emperor 6, 247
harrowing of hades/preaching in hades 588, 606, 613
Hegesias of Cyrene 665
hells 25, 259
Heraclitus of Ephesus 665
Hermeias, Manichaean missionary 232, 239, 261
Hermogenes 32
Herod 34, 35, 36, 44, 52, 53, 54, 294, 623, 663
heteroousion 135, 466
Hexapla 136, 219
Hieracas 82, 215, 324, 338
  biography 316
Hieracites 215
Holy Spirit
  alleged to be Melchizedek 2, 78, 82, 318, 322
  allegedly a creature of the Son 346, 382, 383, 480, 482, 483, 514, 600, 619
  allegedly different from God's essence 74, 480, 482
  allegedly greater than Christ 428
  an entity 95
  as creator 346, 486, 488
  divinity 380, 381, 383
  divinity denied 346, 382, 383, 480, 482, 483, 514
  excerpt from *Ancoratus* on 484–499
  in female form 72
  meanings of the term 489–499
  as object of worship 493–494, 499
  personality 493–503
  scriptural names 484
  speaker in both Testaments 309
  speaker in scriptures 86
  subsistence of 94, 95, 96, 226
  uncreated 377
  uniqueness 498, 499
Holy Week 422, 424, 506
homoeousion 411, 444, 460, 470, 480, 481, 522, 535
homoousion 400, 401, 411, 443, 444, 446, 460, 468, 469, 470, 473, 480, 481, 518, 522, 523, 535, 544, 545, 546, 549, 586
Hosius, bishop of Cordova 460
hospitality 2, 85, 101, 235, 288, 336, 504, 512, 681
human mind in Jesus replaced by Christ himself 608–612
human mind not a entity 611–612
human nature of Christ
  complete 56, 212, 355, 601–606, 636, 674
  incomplete 582, 599–600, 601
  only apparent 215, 276
  reality 338, 374–375, 377–378, 388–389, 391–393, 394, 405, 602–603, 612, 672
  sinless 389, 442, 595, 612, 673
Hymenaeus, bishop of Jerusalem 248
Hypatian, bishop 468, 471

Hypatius, Epiphanius' copyist 482, 483, 681
hypostasis 463, 585

idolatry 51, 120, 184, 191, 211, 230, 291, 314, 357, 374, 521, 574, 635, 637, 640, 681
Iexai 71
image = likeness of a son to a father 462
image of God
= divinity of the Son 225, 438, 440–441, 454, 476
allegedly = the body 414, 416, 417
allegedly = the soul 416
allegedly = virtue 417
allegedly conferred by baptism 417, 440
allegedly lost by Adam 138, 415–416
and long hair on men 279, 651
Man made in 159, 245, 411, 414, 415, 512
Son is the image of God 437, 453, 476
Immanuel 591, 592, 596, 642
immortality 158–160, 161, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 169, 172, 173, 174, 175, 184, 192, 197, 205, 305, 346, 378, 459, 464, 590, 591, 596, 625, 665, 666, 667
impassibility
of Christ 55, 363, 457, 487
of Christ's divine nature 58, 89, 149, 353, 365, 369, 370, 377, 395, 559, 597, 609–610, 674, 675, 676
of a creator with respect to its creature 447
of devil 160
of divine Word 57, 365, 369, 487, 559, 588, 589
of God 93, 354, 355, 364, 384, 387, 396, 447, 548, 553, 559–560, 610
of the Holy Spirit 560
of the Trinity 559, 573
impurity. *See* purity/impurity
Incarnation of Christ 25, 31, 42, 46, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55, 57, 60, 61, 75, 76, 80, 106, 127, 128, 198, 215, 218, 223, 226, 257, 318, 322, 350, 351, 352, 353, 363, 364, 365, 375, 381, 384, 391, 393, 394, 402, 430, 432, 442, 446, 559, 581, 586, 590, 596, 597, 600, 601, 602, 603, 608, 609, 610, 618, 620, 621, 623, 627, 633, 634, 636, 654, 658, 659, 673, 674, 679
Christ allegedly appears grown in the world 33, 34
includes human frailties 338, 374–375, 377–378, 388–389, 391–393, 394, 405, 602–603, 612, 672
willingly undergone 19
ingeneracy. *See also* generacy of the Son (Aetius' term)
Father termed ingenerate 338, 537, 545, 546, 563, 565, 567, 573, 574, 575
and generacy contrasted 522–527, 547, 555, 556, 569
implies unlikeness of essence 523, 537, 542, 543, 549, 554, 565, 572
once applied loosely to the Son as a synonym for "uncreated" 538
propriety of the terms 536, 537
Son termed generate 537, 545, 554
intemperance 5, 132, 184, 185, 187
Isaiah 9, 19, 31, 41, 44, 56, 61, 62, 76, 77, 89, 97, 140, 170, 213, 309, 317, 319, 357, 376, 378, 417, 418, 492, 517, 587, 607, 642, 654, 672

James the Just 45, 246, 621, 622, 623, 626, 627, 639
Jephthah's daughter 79, 635
Jerusalem
episcopal succession 246–247
heavenly Jerusalem 20, 302
Jesus = tree of knowledge 279
Jews 50, 53, 54, 58, 59, 84, 120, 217, 218, 223, 268, 288, 289, 290, 294, 298, 358, 359, 363, 387, 391, 407, 409, 420, 422, 423, 424, 426, 431, 432, 517, 520, 551, 618, 672
John (Melitian) 328
John the Evangelist 37, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 64, 352
Joseph
alleged relations with Mary 581, 613, 616, 620–621, 628, 632–633
and birth of Jesus 30, 52
death 623
encouraged virginity 627, 645
first marriage and children 36, 246, 620–621, 622, 626
Jesus' supposed father 36, 37, 42, 56, 621
Mary betrothed to 30, 366
Mary entrusted to 620, 624
not having relations with Mary 30, 36, 621, 626, 628, 632–633
parentage 351, 620
in the position of father to Jesus 621
Jovian, emperor 248, 332

Judaea, annexation to the Romans 53, 54
Julian the Apostate 248, 332, 511, 580
Julius, bishop of Rome 331, 433, 434
  letter from Marcellus 434–436

key of David 80, 139
knowledge, intellectual and experiential 373, 374

laity 107, 110, 113, 342, 412, 426, 473, 650, 671, 679
lamplighting prayers 647, 680
Law 2, 25, 26, 33, 34, 39, 60, 63, 64, 65, 74, 77, 89, 114, 120, 122, 179, 180, 181, 182, 187, 188, 201, 229, 232, 267, 281, 282, 290, 291, 296, 298, 299, 300, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 310, 311, 312, 317, 332, 352, 358, 364, 384, 387, 400, 401, 412, 414, 423, 424, 462, 474, 475, 484, 486, 488, 498, 506, 507, 508, 519, 577, 584, 585, 613, 614, 615, 617, 620, 634, 651, 652, 672, 673, 676, 679, 681
Law = death 300, 307
laws, several within human being 193–194
Leonidas 134
Leontius (Arian) 332, 336, 428
Leucippus 664
Leucius, friend of John the evangelist 32
Liberius, bishop of Rome 505
Licinius, emperor 248
light (Manichaean) 228, 229, 230, 233, 235, 236, 240, 241, 244, 252–256, 290–291, 357
likeness of the Son to the Father 441, 447, 449, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 466, 467, 469, 470–471, 512, 513, 517, 532, 543
Living Father (Manichaean) 254, 275, 370
Living Spirit (Manichaean) 253, 254, 255, 256, 261, 273, 274
  creation of the luminaries 254
  creation of the world 254, 274
  crucifixion of the archons 256, 261, 274
Longinus, bishop of Ascalon 55, 336
Lucian 513
Lucius, Arian bishop of Alexandria 333, 339
Lucius of Nicomedia 336
Luke the evangelist 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 41, 42, 45, 46, 47, 48, 56, 61, 63, 64
luminaries 172, 173, 237, 244, 254, 255, 258, 260, 275, 276, 281, 315, 425, 458, 542, 551
lunar year
  intercalation 425
  Jewish computation 59, 425
Lupician, persecutes Massalians 647

Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem 336, 337
Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople 468, 472
Macrinus, bishop of Jamnia 336
magi 34, 35, 36, 52, 53, 315, 596, 606, 623, 662, 663, 670
Magusaeans 670
Man
  composed of soul and body 159, 166, 173, 275, 589, 603–604
  in the image of First Man (Manichean) 253, 254, 259, 271, 272, 273, 274
  in the image of God 159, 245, 411, 414, 415, 512
Mani 215, 338, 359, 589, 594, 603, 648
Manichaean book in 22 sections 240
Marcellus 232, 233, 234, 235, 237, 238, 252, 287, 305
Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra 411, 444, 458
Marcion 6, 224, 594
Marcionites 23, 135, 212, 389, 603, 617
Mark, bishop of Arethusa 467
Mark the evangelist 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 45, 48, 61
marriage
  blessed by Jesus 14, 63
  continence in 14, 118, 119
  permitted by church 4, 14, 15, 106–107, 118–120, 133, 321–322
  permitted by sects 665
  priests and holy 106–107, 113, 628
  rejected or forbidden by sects 1, 4, 5, 14, 15, 116–117, 131, 197, 215, 317, 652
  second marriage 2, 15, 106, 108, 109, 110, 678
  second marriage allowed to laity 107, 113
  versus single life 14, 678
Marthana, descendant of Elxai 1, 71
Marthus 1
martyrdom 2, 88, 134, 135, 178, 186, 247, 288, 324–326, 336, 511, 627
  of Peter of Alexandria 324–326, 335
Martyrians 581

Mary
alleged relations with Joseph 581, 613, 616, 620–621, 628, 632–633
allegedly not the mother of Christ 234
betrothed to Joseph 30, 366
birth 642, 643
conception of Christ 75, 351, 478, 628, 642
contrasted with Eve 630–631
did not live with John 623–624
end of her life 624, 635
entrusted to Joseph 620
mother of the living 630
not a priest 638–639
not be be worshiped 635, 640–641
not having relations with Joseph 30, 36, 621, 626, 628, 632–633
offerings to/in the name of 581, 635
originator of sacred virginity 637
parents of 630, 641
a prophetess 628–629
relationship to Elizabeth 45, 126, 367, 487, 626, 630
virgin birth of Christ 30, 31, 73, 269, 587–588, 620–621, 630, 673
Massalians 581, 661
Matter 236, 245, 253, 254, 275
Epiphanius' definition 245–246
its creation of growing things (Manichaean) 254, 275
its creation of man (Manichaean) 254
Matthew the evangelist 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 41, 45, 47, 48, 61
Maximian, emperor 104, 248, 324, 334, 514
Maximon, bishop of Jerusalem 469
meat, abstention from 1, 4, 14, 71, 100, 139, 236, 319, 323, 626, 627, 664, 680
Melchizedek 2, 78, 82, 318, 322, 638
Melchizedekians 2, 318, 617
Melissus 664
Melitians 215, 334, 340, 341, 511
Melitus, bishop of Antioch 468, 472, 473, 480
inaugural sermon 443, 473–479
Melitus, founder of Melitians 333, 335, 336, 341
Menophilus, Arian 514
Merinthians 351, 367
Methodius 143, 150, 168, 179, 203, 207
Dialogue on Resurrection 143–195
Metrodorus 664
millennium 614–615
miracles of Jesus in childhood 46
monks 215, 651, 678–681
monogamy 14, 122
Montanists, location 1, 22, 23, 25
Montanus 1
moon (in Manichaean teaching) 237, 250, 251, 255, 259, 260, 272, 275, 277, 280, 294, 309, 315
Moses 2, 12, 13, 15, 25, 39, 67, 74–75, 79, 91, 92, 114, 124, 145, 149, 175, 186, 202, 206, 207, 217, 218, 229, 259, 260, 268, 280, 282, 291, 300, 301, 302, 305, 306, 309, 317, 351, 382, 390, 391, 398, 400, 417, 458, 486, 487, 498, 507, 594, 596, 615, 618, 628, 635, 638, 649, 652, 654, 672
Mother of all 251
Mother of Life 251, 253, 260, 271
Mother of Light 289
Mt. Tabor 47
mystery cults 668–671

nakedness in worship 1, 69–70
Nativity of Christ, date 56
natures of Christ
alleged to be curtailed in Christ 584, 588
alleged to be only apparent 215, 276
alleged to lack a mind 581, 582, 599, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605
human nature alleged complete 56, 212, 355, 601–606, 636, 674
human nature alleged incomplete 582, 599–600, 601
impassible 58, 89, 149, 353, 365, 369, 370, 377, 395, 559, 597, 609–610, 674, 675, 676
reality of 338, 374–375, 377–378, 388–389, 391–393, 394, 405, 602–603, 612, 672
sinlessness 389, 442, 595, 612, 673
Navatus 2, 104, 216, 433
nazirites 621, 626, 627, 651
Nazoraeans 71, 352
Nicaea, Council of 104, 106, 327, 434, 583
Creed 421, 441, 469, 479, 503, 505, 585, 586, 600
deposes Arius 340, 584
Nicene Creed 421, 441, 469, 479, 503, 505, 585, 586, 600
Noah 4, 5, 27, 37, 38, 80, 82, 83, 132, 291, 310, 311, 352, 382, 415, 417, 541, 646, 658
allotment of the world 310–311

Noetians 2, 123
Noetus 2, 216, 217
Numerian, emperor 248

Offspring (favored Arian term for the Son, also used by Ephanius) 268, 398, 431, 448, 449, 475, 476, 481, 518, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 532, 533, 535, 537, 538, 539, 540, 542, 543, 547, 548, 549, 550, 554, 555, 557, 560, 561, 568, 570, 571, 573, 574, 575
Onan 131, 206
Ordinance of the Apostles 422, 423, 424, 426, 509
Origen 2, 3, 34, 82, 216, 249, 317, 318, 513
Origenists 2, 3
originated God (allegedly Origenist term) 141

pagan practices forbidden by Church 14, 15, 113, 519, 681
Panaetius of Rhodes 667
Pancratius, bishop 471
Paphnutius, Melitian anchorite 328
Paraclete 7, 13, 16, 17, 392, 462, 471, 494
  as Manichaean term 239, 240, 245, 246, 259, 285, 286
Paradise 1, 3, 16, 70, 138, 153, 163, 164, 173, 177–178, 179, 181, 187, 318, 484, 631
  in Manichaean sense 258, 266, 278, 279, 288
Parmenides 664
Paschal Feast 421, 422, 423, 424, 426
Passover (= Easter unless otherwise noted)
  allegedly not to be celebrated by Christians 506
  catholic dating 24–25
  celebration limited to one day per year 1, 24
  celebration on the Jewish date 411, 420–421
  Jewish eaten on the wrong day in Jesus' time 58, 59
  number of Jewish Passovers in the Fourth Gospel 63, 64
  scriptural justification 508, 509
  variations in dating 25, 26
Patripassianism 91–94, 217, 344, 355, 364
Patrophilus, Arian bishop of Scythopolis 469
Paul 4, 13, 14, 15, 18, 37, 65, 79, 89, 90, 95, 97, 103, 121, 145, 146, 168, 170, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 185, 187, 188, 190, 191, 193, 194, 206, 286, 289, 306, 313, 314, 318, 322, 449, 450, 451, 452, 463, 490, 491, 497, 502, 508, 509, 588, 590, 591, 592, 596, 605, 608, 611, 612, 629, 634, 639, 646, 648, 650, 651, 680
Paul the Samosatian 215, 411, 428, 429, 430, 442, 458
Paulianists 215
Paulinus, bishop of Antioch 337, 582, 599, 600
  confession of faith 599–600
Peleus 325
penance 105, 106, 110, 122, 307, 325, 328, 331, 658
  after lapse under persecution 110, 115, 325, 328
Pentecost 50, 64, 467, 508–509, 679
Pepuza 1, 20, 22, 512
Pepuzians 1, 20
Persaeus 667
pestilence sent by chief archons 250, 256, 277
Peter, bishop of Alexandria 324, 325, 326, 333, 335
Peter the apostle 12, 13, 18, 32, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 58, 62, 99, 104, 105, 110, 111, 145, 149, 183, 207, 246, 290, 308, 324, 325, 326, 333, 335, 368, 369, 408, 471, 493, 536, 550, 588, 596, 609, 624, 639
Phaedo 186
Phaenaretes the midwife 663
Pherecydes 664
Philip, bishop of Scythopolis 482
Philip the evangelist 22, 29, 39, 40, 43, 44, 47, 62, 100, 286, 469, 629, 639
Philosabbatius 34
philosophies 663, 667, 668
Philumen, consecrated by Cyril of Jerusalem 482
Photinus 411, 441, 442, 443, 444, 600
Phrygians in Thyatira 66
Pillar of Light/Glory 255, 289
Plato 186, 279, 665
Pneumatomachi 411, 444
Polycarp of Smyrna 421
Porphyry 34
Porter (Manichaean) 249, 250, 254, 255, 256, 260, 275, 282
Posidonius of Apamaea 667
possessions
  renunciation of 116, 647, 648
  righteous ownership 118, 119, 308
Potamon, bishop of Heracleopolis 330
Praxiphanes of Rhodes 666
prayer at night hours 680, 681

preaching
of apostles 205, 457, 650
of Jesus 46, 47, 48, 51, 57, 60, 61, 62, 63, 276
priesthood
abolition of 81
apostles as preachers 650
celibacy of 628
of Christ 364, 365, 366
circumcised priesthood 80
deaconesses 639, 640, 679
earn their living 650
living in luxury and wantonness 413
Mary not allowed 638–639
ordained by Melitius 326, 327
priestesses 640
standards of behavior 106–107, 110, 650, 678
suppored by laity 650
women as 1, 22, 639
Prince of this world (Manichaean) 293
Priscilla 1, 6, 7, 22, 66, 637
Priscillianists (Quintillianists) 1, 20, 21, 26
privations (as philosophical term) 524, 525, 526, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 561, 562
Probus, emperor 216, 227, 246, 248, 305
procession of the Holy Spirit 513
Proclus, Origenist teacher 148, 150
Prodicus 665
prophecy, rational 8, 9, 10, 12, 16, 18, 19
prophets deceived 259, 260
Protagoras 664
Proverbs 8:22
Epiphanius' discussion 341, 343, 348, 350, 352, 353
interpretation 451, 456, 465, 476
psilanthropism 2, 27, 28, 32, 45, 73, 77–78, 93, 216, 223, 351, 361, 375, 390
Purists (Cathari) 2, 116
purity/impurity 14, 28, 110, 131, 183, 197, 211, 258, 282, 288, 413, 417, 426, 627, 634, 635, 651, 652
Pyrrho of Elis 665
Pythagoras of Samos 664

quaternity instead of Trinity (Apolinarian accusation of catholic doctrine) 585, 590, 591
queens, sixty 653, 654, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 663
Quintillianists (Priscillianists) 1, 20, 21, 26
Qunitilla 1, 66, 637

rain as sweat/effluent of archons/ chief archon 256, 262
readers, order of 678
rebaptism 412, 579, 580, 671
rebirth as punishment for soul 236, 237, 250, 257
redemption 57, 170, 486, 491, 591. *See also* atonement
reed mattresses used by Manichaeans 239
renunciation 116, 117, 119, 412, 506, 647, 648
renunciation of the world 505
repentance
after baptism 109, 112, 113
after lapse under persecution 110, 115, 325, 328
none after death 112
rescue of the entrapped soul (Manichaean) 236
resurrection of Body of Christ 58, 59, 370, 387, 394, 601, 676
= the cheating of Hades 301, 378, 393, 394, 606
resurrection of the dead 16, 25, 26, 77, 263, 265, 313, 315, 394, 613, 614, 676
affirmed by sects 4, 6, 22, 24, 174
apparent 589
defended 4, 89, 138, 195–214, 321
denied by sects 3, 88, 138, 173, 215, 317, 318
includes resurrection of the flesh 24, 175, 187, 317, 318, 321, 435
Origen's version 142–146, 148–150, 163, 167, 168, 170, 172–175, 187
Origen's version 138
as resurrection of the soul only 173, 174, 215, 317, 318, 321, 605
spiritual resurrection 255, 316
Rhinocorura 310
Right Hand (Manichaean term) 233, 253, 273, 274
Rome, Council of 583
roots, two (Manichaean) 229, 308

Sabaoth 259, 492
Sabbath 64, 217, 309, 310, 311, 312, 424, 499, 679, 680, 681
Sabellianism 599
Sabellius 216, 226, 338, 345, 397, 400, 411, 433, 441, 518, 600
saints 7, 8, 15, 16, 65, 67, 174, 177, 205, 212, 233, 246, 272, 284, 287, 288, 317, 465, 485, 487, 489, 490, 494, 498, 500, 510, 529, 539, 592, 594, 621, 633, 635, 636, 641, 671

salvation 30, 59, 60, 61, 74, 75, 104, 105, 109, 111, 113, 141, 192, 202, 212, 233, 234, 255, 290, 352, 354, 357, 358, 363, 389, 390, 391, 393, 488, 501, 551, 589, 597, 598, 602, 610, 612, 674, 677, 679
alleged not available anciently (Manichaean doctrine) 305
alleged not available to children 318
of spirit without body 313
Samaritans 49, 57, 82, 83, 84, 646, 654
Samosatians 217, 225
Sampsaeans 1
Sardica, Council of, 343 A.D. 223, 428, 444, 445
Sarmatas 334, 339
Satan, worship of 647
Satanists 581
Saturnalia 51
Secundus, bishop of Pentapolis 335, 339
Seleucia, Council of, 359 A.D. 443, 469, 482, 489
Synodical Letter of 470–472
Semi-Arians 411, 483
Serapion of Thmuis, refutation of Mani 249
Sethians 100, 617
sexual relations, abstinence from 103, 107, 652, 678
Shechem (Neapolis) 635, 646
Shem 82, 83, 84, 310, 311
Silvanus, Audian bishop in Gothia 427, 468
Silvanus, bishop of Tarsus 472
sin
after baptism 109, 112, 113
atonement 486, 587, 632
redemption 57, 170, 486, 491, 591
responsibility for 153, 162, 176, 209, 211, 273, 292, 314, 378, 504, 635
sinful thoughts 133, 165, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 545, 617
single life 14, 678
Sirmium, Council of, first 351 A.D. 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 444, 445, 460
skin tunics
= body 70, 138, 152, 153
= mortality 158, 163, 164
miraculously made 202
Socrates 186, 663
Son. *See also* begetting of the Son; Offspring (favored Arian term for the Son, also used by Ephanius)
alleged creaturehood 72, 139, 142, 338, 341, 344–345, 346, 362, 363, 364, 382, 383, 411, 412, 434, 443, 446–447, 455, 456, 457, 459, 465, 468, 469, 479, 482, 504, 514, 518–519, 529, 531, 586, 618
allegedly inferior to the Father 50, 353, 374, 379, 466
allegedly not the Word 218, 591
allegedly once non-existent 337, 338, 434, 442, 477
allegedly unlike the Father 466
almighty 567
appeared in Adam 72
creates the twelve water jars 255, 275, 276
creator 346, 382, 383, 480, 482, 483, 514, 600, 619
equality with the Father 517
eternity 568–569
generacy of the Son (Aetius' term) 338, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 537, 538, 542, 543, 546, 547, 549, 554, 555, 556, 563, 565, 567, 568, 569, 572, 573, 574, 575
image of God 437, 453, 476
immutable 338, 560
King 438, 439
likeness of the Son to the Father 441, 447, 449, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 466, 467, 469, 470–471, 512, 513, 514, 517, 532, 543
meaning of the term "Son of God" (Anomoean) 447–449, 453, 486
only-begotten 94, 127, 137, 141, 159, 217, 219, 220, 221–222, 223, 225, 234, 265, 266, 276, 322–323, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 354, 356, 357, 358, 359, 361, 363, 370, 373–374, 375, 378, 380, 387, 391, 397, 402, 406, 418, 420, 429, 435, 437, 438, 439, 442, 445, 449, 450, 455, 457, 460, 476–477, 494–495, 500, 513, 516, 544, 548, 559–565, 567–570, 633
preexistence 483
scriptural names for 494
termed generate 537, 545, 554
uncreated 560
Son-Father 2, 338, 345, 457
Son of Man 39, 77, 81, 98–99, 128, 144, 293, 312, 362, 364, 365, 383, 387, 406, 408, 417, 429, 454, 510, 585, 617
Sonship of the Son 379, 439, 448, 450, 454, 459, 465, 481, 523, 538
denied 343–344, 454–456, 457
Soul
allegedly = image of God 416
as armor of the good God/First Man 251, 252

as bait for archons 270
eaten by archons 253, 257, 259, 270, 271, 304
human body as prison of the fallen 156, 157, 158, 159
immortality 169, 174, 175
luminous (Manichaean) 250
possessed by the Son's human nature 673
preexistence of 137
rebirth as punishment for 236, 237, 250, 257
resurrection of the soul only 173, 174, 215, 317, 318, 321, 605
the same in all 145
taken and cleansed by sun's rays 255
transmigration 279
Spirit, meanings of the term 489–499
Spirithood of the Spirit 125, 130, 355
denied 217
star of Bethlehem 31, 34, 35, 52
stars 275–276
Stephen, Arian 332
Strato of Lampsacus 666
streams, miraculous 62
sufferings of Christ 585, 675
sun and moon as ships 237, 250
sun takes load of souls from moon 237, 250, 255
Sunday a day of enjoyment 679
Synod of Paris 360 A.D. 583
Synodical Letter of Seleucia 470–472
Syntagmation of Aetius the Anomoean 511, 522–528

Tacitus, emperor 248
Tascodrugians 1, 6, 20
Tatian 1, 3, 4, 6, 116
tautoousion 518
Temporists 522, 528
Temptation of Jesus 39, 42–43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 57, 62, 64, 675
testament of death (Manichean) 300–301
Testaments not from one Teacher 301
Thales of Miletus 663
Thecla 605, 629, 641
Theodoras 665
Theodotians 2
Theodotus of Byzantium 2, 73
Theonas, Melitian bishop of Alexandria 239, 334, 339, 340
Theophrastus of Ephesus 666
Thermutis, Pharaoh's daughter 635
Third Elder (Manichaean) 260
Thomas, Manichaean missionary 232, 239, 261
Thomas the apostle 3, 116, 149, 198, 395, 453, 588, 591, 639, 675
Thrace 311, 637
Tiberius, emperor 32, 45, 55, 276, 305, 623
Titus of Bostra, refutation of Mani 226, 242, 249
tradition 121, 122
transcendence
of God 357, 398, 522, 527, 531, 532, 534, 552, 555, 568, 571
of the Holy Spirit 622
of the Son/Christ 466, 476, 532, 534, 612
of the Trinity 533, 571
transfiguation of Christ 145, 149, 408, 596
translators, order of 679
Treasury (Manichaean book) 229, 240
Trees, good and evil (in Manichaean thought) 278–279
Trinity
affirmed by sects 6–7, 24, 312, 405
Alexander of Alexandria's version 333–334
allegedly replaced by a quaternity 585, 590, 591
Arian version 115, 125, 126, 129, 338, 400, 409, 433, 481, 483, 503, 599, 636, 4779
confusion of Persons 2, 92, 93, 123, 216, 218, 221, 222
cooperation of Persons 74, 361, 429, 493, 495, 543, 561, 569, 599
creator 557–558
distinction of Persons 93–95, 129, 346, 357, 461, 488, 671
equality of the Persons 358, 389–390, 513, 516, 518, 534, 561, 585, 599
erroneous separation of the Persons 75, 128, 412, 619
eternity 520, 543, 561, 565, 568, 573, 574
gave Moses the Law 672
indivisible 127, 416, 571
ingenerate/uncreated 559, 561, 564, 566, 567, 568, 570, 571, 572, 574
perfection of the Persons 95, 125, 225, 361, 371, 381, 384, 389, 409, 433, 500, 502, 503, 516, 518, 543, 545, 555, 560, 565, 568, 572, 599, 671, 676
Persons seen by the prophets 672
preserver of created things 568

receives no addition 591, 671
sent the prophets 672
subsistence of the Persons 222, 223, 226, 461, 599
transcendence 550, 555
Trinity in unity (various statement of the catholic doctrine) 94–95, 100, 124–125, 316, 347, 358, 361, 380, 381, 389, 404, 409, 413, 498, 503, 545, 571, 573, 671, 675
Trypho, Mani's opponent in debate 238–239
Turbo, disciple of Mani 233, 234, 235, 237, 252
narrative of 252–261
Twelve steersmen 260
two first principles (Manichaean) 215, 224–225, 235, 242, 287, 288

Uncreated, God the 579
undertakers, order of 679
unlikeness of the Son to the Father. *See* likeness of the Son to the Father
Upper Scythia 637
Uranius, Audian bishop in Gothia 427
Uranius, bishop of Tyre 468, 471
Ursaces, Arian bishop in Pannonia 331

Valens, Arian bishop in Pannonia 331, 467, 468, 584
Valens, emperor 8, 247, 248, 333, 342, 362
Valentinian, emperor 8, 248
Valentinians 55, 88, 135
Valentinus, Gnostic teacher 2, 60, 338, 438, 594
Vales 100
Valesians 2
Victor, bishop of Rome 421
vigils 649, 679, 680
virgin birth of Christ 30, 31, 73, 269, 587–588, 620–621, 630, 673
Virgin of Light 256, 260
virgin prophetesses in sects 22
virginity 14, 105, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 133, 321, 322, 323, 426, 678
virginity of James, John and James the Just 624, 626, 627
Vitalius, bishop of Antioch 599, 600, 601

Walls (Manichaean) 309, 310, 311
water
as eucharistic element 4, 5, 43, 62, 63, 116
venerated 72
Wednesday, Friday and Saturday services 679
widows and widowhood 14, 15, 107, 108, 120, 121, 215, 318, 640, 678
wine forbidden by sects 4, 5
winter solstice 51
Wisdom 160, 170, 173, 186, 218, 320, 348, 350, 450–452, 453, 455, 467, 476, 607
in Prov. 8:22 = Christ's human nature 348
women
clergy 1, 22, 637, 638, 639, 640, 643, 644
and men not to associate 652
Word of God 82, 362, 429, 435, 442, 453, 588
allegedly not the Son 429, 434, 585
allegedly transformed into flesh 220, 581, 584, 585, 587–593, 600, 603–604, 607, 610, 611
equated with a human word 217, 218, 219
equated with God's reason 431
eternal 1, 28
subsistence 94, 95, 217, 218, 219, 220, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 338, 350, 384, 438, 442, 447, 451, 458, 461, 463, 464, 467, 476, 488, 489, 500, 531, 532, 535, 540, 546, 552, 599, 610
work, abstention from 277–278, 648, 681

Xenophanes 664

Zeno, bishop of Tyre 336, 664
Zeno, founder of the Stoics 279, 666, 667
Zeno of Elea 664
Zeno the Stoic 666–667
zodiac 51, 237